

JPRS-UKO-84-006

8 March 1984

USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 18, December 1983

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

8 March 1984

USSR REPORT

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No 18, December 1983

Translations from the Russian-language theoretical organ of the CPSU Central Committee published in Moscow (18 issues per year).

CONTENTS

Statement by Yu. V. Andropov, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium	1
Marx's Theory and Bourgeois Falsifications (F. Teplov)	5
Moscow State University Party Conference (V. Arkhipenko)	20
Modern Applied Mathematics and Computer Experiment (A. Samarskiy)	34
High Responsibility of Criticism	48
New Levels of Cooperation Among CEMA-Member Countries (A. Bykov)	58
New Agreement Tested by Life (V. Kuz'min, R. Lozhnikov)	71
First Victory Over Fascism (Ernst Henry)	78
USSR in the Vanguard of the Struggle for Human Rights (Yu. Deporov)	89
Communist Party of Greece Stands for Fundamental Changes (Grigoris Faracos)	101
Year 1983; Most Important Trends in International Development (Yu. Molchanov, V. Nekrasov)	108

Heine Was Right (A. Gulgya)	128
Book About a Communist's Life (A. Zholkver)	131
"Carnation Revolution" in Portugal (Jose Freitas)	137
Mechanism of Imperialist Aggression (N. Chervov)	139
Department of Blood-Stained Affairs (Yuriy Zhukov)	147
Index of Articles and Materials Published in KOMMUNIST in 1983	151

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATION FROM KOMMUNIST, No 18
December 1983

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "Pravda"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : December 1983

Signed to press : 13 December 1983

Copies : 835,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda".
"Kommunist", 1983

STATEMENT BY YU. V. ANDROPOV, GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE
AND CHAIRMAN OF THE USSR SUPREME SOVIET PRESIDUM

PM241710 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 83 (signed to press 13 Dec 83) pp 3-6

[PRAVDA, 25 Nov 83]

[Text] The leadership of the Soviet Union has already apprised Soviet people and other peoples of its assessment of the present U.S. Administration's militarist course and warned the U.S. Government and the Western countries which are at one with it about the dangerous consequences of that course.

However, Washington, Bonn, London, and Rome have failed to heed the voice of reason--the siting of the American medium-range missiles is starting on the territory of the FRG, Britain, and Italy. Thus the appearance of the American Pershings and cruise missiles on the European continent is becoming an accomplished fact.

For almost 40 years--longer than ever in modern history--Europe has been living under conditions of peace. This has been possible thanks to the consistently peace-loving policy of the socialist community countries, to the efforts of the continent's peace-loving forces, and also to the realistic position of sober-minded politicians in the West. The approximate equilibrium of military forces, including nuclear forces, which has taken shape in Europe between the North Atlantic alliance states and the Warsaw Pact states has objectively served the cause of European security and stability.

Now the United States and NATO as a whole are taking a step aimed at tilting the scales their way. The nuclear missiles being deployed close to the borders of the Soviet Union and its allies are by no means intended for the defense of Western Europe--no one is threatening it. The siting of the American missiles on European soil increases not Europe's security but the real danger that the United States will bring disaster on the peoples of Europe.

In the two world wars U.S. territory was not touched by the flames of destruction. Washington would still like to believe that, while deploying its medium-range missiles in Europe and thus creating an additional nuclear threat to the socialist countries, it will be able to divert a retaliatory strike from its own doorstep. As for the security of the U.S. West European allies, that seems to interest the American leaders precisely to the extent

that the West Europeans will be able, with their lives and their cities, to lessen the retribution visited on the United States itself, if Washington should give in to the temptation to unleash a nuclear war in the illusory hope of winning it.

The deployment of the American nuclear missiles in West Europe is by no means a step brought about by a reaction to some alleged concern in the West regarding the present correlation of the sides' forces in Europe. It has been shown repeatedly and on the basis of specific figures--and many politicians and specialists in the West are in agreement with this--that an approximate equality in medium-range nuclear means is currently maintained in Europe between NATO and the Warsaw Pact, while NATO has a considerable superiority in terms of nuclear charges. So that if anyone can feel concern it must be the Warsaw Pact countries, which are threatened by the military machines of the NATO states.

In evaluating all this the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries cannot shut their eyes also to the fact that Washington had declared a "crusade" against socialism as a social system and that those who have now given permission for the siting of the new nuclear armaments on the threshold of our home are building their practical policies on this foolhardy premise. It is as if, by siting the Pershing II and cruise missiles in Europe, the governments of a number of NATO countries would like to install a concrete nuclear missile foundation under this adventurist premise.

Can the Soviet Union and other socialist countries fail to take this danger into account? No, they cannot. This is why the highest party and state leaders of the seven socialist countries declared at their 28 June 1983 Moscow meeting that under no circumstances will they tolerate the NATO bloc's military superiority over the countries of the Warsaw Pact.

In confirming their consent to the siting of the U.S. missiles in their countries the governments of the FRG, Britain, and Italy could not fail to have known that from the very outset the United States had no desire to reach a mutually acceptable accord on nuclear armaments in Europe and has done everything at the talks in Geneva and outside them to prevent such an accord. They also could not fail to have known that the Soviet Union and its allies will obligatorily take the necessary measures to protect their security and to prevent the United States and NATO as a whole from breaking the existing approximate equilibrium of forces in Europe.

We have also stated clearly that the appearance of the new American missiles in West Europe will render impossible the continuation of the negotiations on nuclear arms in Europe which have been taking place in Geneva.

The decisions adopted in recent days by the FRG, British, and Italian governments unequivocally testify that, despite the will of their own peoples, despite their countries' security interests, and despite the interests of European and world peace, these governments have given the "green light" to the installation of the U.S. missiles. Thereby they, together with the U.S. government, have assumed all the responsibility for the consequences of a shortsighted policy about which the Soviet Union gave advance warning.

Having carefully weighed all the aspects of the situation which has been created, the Soviet leadership has adopted the following decisions.

First: Since the United States by its actions has wrecked the possibility of achieving a mutually acceptable accord at the talks on questions of limiting nuclear arms in Europe and since their continuation in these conditions would only be a cover for actions by the United States and a number of other NATO countries aimed at undermining European and international security, the Soviet Union considers it impossible to participate further in these talks.

Second: The commitments unilaterally adopted by the Soviet Union with the objective of creating more favorable conditions for achieving success at the talks are abrogated. The moratorium on the deployment of Soviet medium-range nuclear systems in the European part of the USSR is thereby abrogated.

Third: By agreement with the governments of the GDR and the CSSR the preparatory work begun some time ago, as was announced, for deploying enhanced-range operational-tactical missiles on the territory of those countries will be accelerated.

Fourth: Since by setting its missiles in Europe the United States is increasing the nuclear threat to the Soviet Union, corresponding Soviet means will be deployed in ocean regions and seas taking this circumstance into account. In terms of their characteristics these means of ours will be equal to the threat created for us and our allies by the U.S. missiles being sited in Europe.

Of course, other measures aimed at safeguarding the security of the USSR and the other socialist community countries will also be taken.

In embarking on the implementation of the decisions we have taken, we state that the countermeasures from the Soviet side will be restricted strictly to the limits which will be dictated by the NATO countries' actions. The Soviet Union--and we stress this once again--does not seek military superiority, and we will do only what is absolutely necessary to ensure that the military balance is not disrupted.

If the United States and the other NATO countries display a readiness to return to the situation which existed prior to the commencement of the siting of U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe, the Soviet Union too will be ready to do likewise. And then the proposals which we submitted earlier regarding questions of limiting and reducing nuclear arms in Europe would come into force again. In this event, that is, provided the previous situation is reestablished, the USSR's unilateral pledges in this sphere would also come back into force.

The Soviet Union declares most definitely and firmly that it continues to adhere to a principled course toward ending the arms race, and above all the nuclear arms race, and toward reducing and ultimately totally eliminating the threat of nuclear war. It will continue to make every effort to achieve these noble aims.

As before the Soviet Union advocates the most radical solution of the question of nuclear arms in Europe. It repeats its proposal that Europe be made altogether free of nuclear weapons--both medium-range and tactical.

The Soviet leadership appeals to the leaders of the United States and of the states of Western Europe to weigh up once again all the consequences with which the implementation of the plans for the deployment of the new U.S. missiles in Europe threatens their own peoples and all mankind.

We are already living, even now, in a peace that is too fragile. Responsible statesmen must therefore evaluate what is taking place and take the rational decision. Only human reason can and must safeguard mankind from the awesome danger. We call upon those who are nudging the world along the path of an ever more dangerous arms race to renounce the unrealizable calculations of achieving military superiority by such a path with the aim of dictating their will to other peoples and states.

The Soviet Union is convinced that peace can be consolidated and the security of the peoples guaranteed not by building up and devising more and more new types of armaments, but on the contrary, by reducing the existing armaments to immeasurably lower levels. Mankind has too many tasks which are going unresolved merely because of the diversion of colossal material, intellectual and other resources. And from this viewpoint, the reaching of agreement on a radical reduction of nuclear and other armaments would be a boon for all peoples.

The Soviet leadership declares that, fulfilling the will of the Soviet people, it will continue to do everything to ward off the threat of war and preserve peace for the present and future generations.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/6

MARX'S THEORY AND BOURGEOIS FALSIFICATIONS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 83 (signed to press 13 Dec 83) pp 7-18

[Article by F. Teplov]

[Text] The drastic aggravation of the ideological confrontation between the two socioeconomic systems and political courses--socialism and imperialism--is a characteristic of the period currently experienced by the nations. "A struggle is under way for the minds and hearts of billions of people on earth," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov noted at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. "The future of mankind will largely depend on the outcome of this ideological struggle." It is focused on K. Marx's theory, which opens the way to the liberation of the working people from all forms of social and national oppression.

No single political and ideological trend has had such a powerful revolutionary impact on the social consciousness and on the course of history itself as Marxism-Leninism. Embodied within the unity of the three powerful flows of the global revolutionary process, the leading factor in which is the socialist commonwealth, our steadily developing theory acts as the most important reorganizing force, opening prospects for the triumph of communist ideals.

That is precisely why the defenders of the exploiting system, the bourgeois ideologues and the opportunists and anticommunists of all possible hues are trying to undermine, to weaken the influence of the Great October Revolution and real socialism on the world and to falsify and discredit Marxism-Leninism--the theoretical expression of the communist movement--and thus to hinder social progress.

The multiple-volume opus "Marxism, Communism and Western Society. A Comparative Encyclopedia," a most "respectable" anticommunist publication extensively publicized in the West, plays an important role in the ideological outfitting of the class enemy. It is a work containing some 400 major articles alone.*

* "Marxism, Communism and Western Society. A Comparative Encyclopedia." Edited by C. D. Kernig. In eight volumes. New York, 1972-73. Corresponding German edition in six volumes: "Sowjetsystem und demokratische Gesellschaft. Eine vergleichende Enzyklopadie." Arsg. von C. D. Kernig in Zusammenarbeit mit Z. K. Brzezinski u. a. 6 Bd. Freiburg, Basel, Vienna, 1966-1972. Again in 1973 there came out the popular variant of the encyclopedia in more than 20 soft-cover publications, aimed at the mass consumer: "Marxismus in Systemvergleich. Grundbegriffe" [Marxism in a Comparative System. Fundamental Principles]. Edited by C. D. Kernig, Frankfurt, New York, 1973.

According to those who inspired, ordered and compiled this "comparative encyclopedia, which bourgeois propaganda publicizes as the "edition of the century," it has been assigned the role of theoretical foundation of contemporary anticommunism, based on long-term service at least "until the end of the century."

This encyclopedia, which took a decade to write and was aimed for the turn of the 1970s, was published in the FRG and in Switzerland and Austria (in German) and overseas (in English). It rallied under a common flag, "Sovietology," i.e., the contemporary form of ideological defense of capitalism with the main theoretical forces of almost 700 authors and editors from 15 countries. The names of the members of the editorial council--K. Cernig, Z. Brzezinski, H. Wetter, D. Geier, J. Calvet, B. Meissner, M. Feinsod, L. Schapiro, and others--speak for themselves. This is a general rally of ideological arms bearers of the old world of all currents, varieties and hues, from non-Marxist interpreters (of Marxism) to "contemporary revisionists," as they are advertised to the public. These are the same "old acquaintances" concealed behind a firm "encyclopedic" screen, and that same old pseudoscience, this time in scientific-like clothing.

The thick folios contain patented anticommunist concepts, theses, stereotypes, "arguments" and "counterarguments," which are directly or indirectly aimed against the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism. Everything acquired by anticommunism since the middle of the 19th century and, particularly, after the victory of the October Revolution, has been considered, updated, edited and, in a word, "encyclopeded."

The study of Western propaganda over the past decade proves that, essentially, its entire theoretical arsenal and even the "quotations" of the founders of the proletarian outlook, naturally, suitably transformed, have been as a rule either reproduced or borrowed and put into circulation directly from this point, from the "Sovietological" compilation, and into the paper pages, newspaper and journal stripes, the air and the television and motion picture screens. It is from the same "source" that the anticommunist and anti-Soviet speculations are drawn and disseminated throughout the world.

In addition to the class roots which determine the common ideological positions of this variegated conglomerate of authors and editors, they are also united by the methodology of distorting Marxism-Leninism. That is why the entire work is, above all, an encyclopedia of all kinds of falsifying methods.

In their aspiration to undermine or at least limit the influence of Marxism-Leninism on the working people, the class enemy, his ideologues and his mass information media are excelling in their attempts to "separate" Leninism from Marxism and to present Leninism in the eyes of those who are naive as something alien and even opposite to Marx's theory. Leninism is interpreted--unlike Marxism, this alleged "Western" doctrine--as "Russified Marxism, used for the seizure of power," as something contrary to Marxism, stemming not from Marx but from Bakunin. In other words, the old myth of the "Russian phenomenon," i.e., of Russia's "special" historical path based on its age-old

"retardation," "anarchism," "extremism" and "lack of democracy," caused by the "immaturity" of the country's popular masses, and so on, and so forth, is being galvanized. Efforts are being made to ascribe to Leninism a strictly local significance as something allegedly of no general historical or even regional value. In the light of such "interpretation" of Marxist-Leninist theory, the socialist revolution (on the basis of which alone a break with capitalism was achieved and subsequently repeated in a variety of countries, along with a transition to socialism), and the experience of the October Revolution as the main event of the 20th century, are presented merely as "scenarios" and as the implementation of the Russian variant of modernization, surmounting backwardness and a means of coming out of the "Third World." That is why, it is alleged, no example can be found here for the benefit of a "Western" (as well as Western-oriented) society.

Such is the main purpose of this "comparative encyclopedia:" to reject Leninism as the revolutionary banner of our epoch. Metaphorically speaking, this is a multiple-targeted ideological warhead of contemporary anticommunism, and each of its articles carries an individual missile the purpose of which is to strike at strictly selected targets, such as "Marx," "Lenin," "Marxism-Leninism," "classes and the class struggle," "the October Revolution," "proletarian dictatorship," "bolshevism," and "socialism."

Understandably, the limitations of a journal article do not allow us to undertake the exposure of this anticommunist publication in terms of all of its theoretical and political positions. We shall limit ourselves to the following three points: the socialist revolution--the role of violence in the peaceful and violent transition to the new society; the dictatorship of the proletariat; and the theory of the communist party.

I

The purpose of the "specialists" in the falsification and distortion of Marxism-Leninism has remained unchanged since the times of Marx and Lenin: to eliminate from the theory of the liberation of the working class its revolutionary content and deprive it of its class orientation.

"At the beginning of the 1870s a noticeable change took place in the views of Marx and Engels regarding the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat," we read in one of the articles written by the notorious bourgeois ideologue W. Leonhard. K. Ballester and W. Schieder, authors of the article on Engels, categorically state that in his later works "he especially separated himself from the concept of revolution, such as the one he and Marx supported in the 1840s." We read the same in the article "Marx" and elsewhere (let us note parenthetically that this postulate is one of the "fundamental" stipulations, the acknowledgment and dissemination of which is a mandatory requirement for the makers of the "comparative encyclopedia").

Where do the "Sovietologists" find the essence of this "noticeable change" in the views of the Marxist classics on the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat? No, this is not in the least any subsequent development of the revolutionary theory, taking into consideration the

experience of the Paris Commune and the changes in objective historical circumstances. Unlike the former concept of the "reorganization of society through a violent revolution...", Leonhard reports, "in their latter years Marx and Engels increasingly emphasized a peaceful transition toward socialism." Allegedly, initially Marx "clearly limited the revolutionary way to power to the framework of the European continent, for in terms of England and America he acknowledged the possibility of a peaceful transition," after which he excluded from the "revolutionary path" the Netherlands. Finally, Engels "added France," i.e., virtually all so-called Western society. Consequently, Russia was left virtually alone in the framework of the "revolutionary path."

The reader must bear in mind that the term "later statements by Marx and Engels" and "peaceful transition" mean the unconditional rejection of the revolution and the exclusion of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is achieved with the help of speculative elaborations through seemingly imperceptible substitution of concepts. Leninism is interpreted exclusively as a "theory of violence." Let us also recall that "priority" in Marxian "subdivisions," i.e., of the separation of his theoretical legacy into the "young" (meaning revolutionary) and "later" (meaning opportunistic or even bourgeois-liberal) was not invented by the authors of the "comparative encyclopedia" but by E. Bernstein, K. Kautsky and other ideologues of the Second International. The "trail blazers" invented in their time this "revolutionary" method in an effort to prove the "wrongfulness" of the October Revolution and thus separate Leninism from Marxism.

Let us now compare the interpretation of the falsifiers with the true positions held by Marx and Engels on the ways leading to the implementation of the socialist revolution in the period after the Paris Commune--the same years the bourgeois interpreters have in mind.

In terms of the method of "revolutionary action" for seizing the power of the state by the working class, the creators of scientific communism--we cite here Marx's speech at the 8 September 1872 meeting in Amsterdam, on the occasion of the conclusion of the Hague Congress of the First International--we note, "we never claimed that this objective could be reached everywhere through the same means.... One should take into consideration the institutions, mores and traditions of different countries. We do not deny that there are countries such as America and England and, had I been more familiar with your own institutions, I may have added to them the Netherlands, where workers can achieve their objectives through peaceful means. However, if such is the case, we must also acknowledge that in most countries on the continent force must be the lever of our revolution. For a while we shall have to resort precisely on force in order definitively to establish the rule of labor" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 18, p 154).* "We must tell the governments: We know that you have an armed force directed against the proletariat; we shall act against you peacefully wherever this proves to be possible and with arms should this become necessary." These were words

* Subsequent references to the collected works of K. Marx and F. Engels will be indicated by volume and page only.

from another speech by Marx, delivered at the meeting of the London Conference of the International Association of Workers (First International) on 21 September 1871 (vol 17, p 649).

The main motive force in history and source of social development is the class struggle, the level and forms of which are largely determined by socio-economic and historical conditions.

Consequently, a sober consideration of objective circumstances is necessary in selecting the means with which to make a revolution, such as existing institutions, establishments, mores and national traditions of the specific country. The method chosen for a radical change or path of revolution depends above all on the nature, the characteristics of the opposing bourgeois state. In principle, the existence of a centralized military-bureaucratic governmental machinery, as Marx proved, calls for the destruction of this machinery, while the degree of its development and activeness largely determine the violence to be used in the revolution and the use of coercive means.

The possibility for the working class to seize power through peaceful means, without an armed uprising or civil war, in the United States, England or the Netherlands, for example, where no military-bureaucratic apparatus existed, was allowed by Marx in the 1870s on an exceptional basis. However, this applied only to the form of class violence and, naturally, did not mean in the least, as the falsifiers of the "comparative encyclopedia" claim, its rejection.

Naturally, a revolution is a violent movement. In the political sense, it means the removal by the revolutionary class, either with the mass use of weapons or without them, the laws and institutions, governments and its organs standing on its way, "but only to the extent," Marx points out, "to which this is necessitated by social development" (vol 45, p 142). This is the decisive stage in the transformation of the revolutionary class into a "legal force," or the power of the state.

The use of violence in the course of the revolution as the culmination of the class struggle is inevitable. Naturally, however, it is a question not of violence in the vulgar interpretation of "bourgeois-Sovietologists," or violence in general, or else specifically of armed violence or simply terror, but of a class violence, a violence applied to the state and the classes. In this sense, Marxism-Leninism understands by violence the achievement of the interests of the ruling class in a general matter and with the power to coerce the entire society. After establishing its power, Marx wrote, the proletariat "must apply measures of violence or governmental measures" (vol 18, p 611). The violence applied by the dictatorship of the proletariat should not be identified merely with forms which presume exclusively military suppression and use of weapons. It operates above all as activities undertaken by the state power, constituting the "concentrated and organized social violence" (vol 23, p 761).

In making a clear distinction between "peaceful" and "violent" movements, Marx brought to light the objective conditions for the transformation of a

"peaceful" into a "violent" development: "Nevertheless, a 'peaceful' movement would become 'violent' by encountering the opposition of those interested in the old order and should they prove to be the losing side...they would rise against the 'legitimate' power" (vol 45, p 142). A mandatory prerequisite and reason for a transition from the "stage of peaceful development to violence with the open use of arms is the opposition, the counter-action to the revolutionary movement which is undergoing its "peaceful stage," i.e., violence on the part of the reactionary forces (not only internal), which are interested in the preservation (or restoration) of the old order.

Engels expressed this dependence in a sharp and extremely clear manner in one of his letters to A. Bedel: "He (H. Muller, author of the book 'The Class Struggle and the German Social Democracy'--the author) claims that violence under all circumstances is revolutionary and is never reactionary; this ass does not realize that when there is no reactionary violence which must be fought, there cannot even be a question of any kind of revolutionary violence; one cannot make a revolution against something which does not even have to be overthrown" (vol 38, pp 419-420). Therefore, if there is no reactionary violence there could not even be a question of any revolutionary violence.

Finally, Marx tore off from counterrevolutionary violence in its ideological cover its propaganda camouflage. Marx's words cited below are an answer to that part of the 10 September 1878 Reichstag speech by the imperial minister of internal affairs who publicly misrepresented "the doctrine and objectives of the social democracy," slanderously interpreting, in particular, the Marxist concept of the final objective of the labor movement as being allegedly "one which can be achieved only through violence."

"What Eilenburg preaches," Marx wrote (and, let us add, what his current followers preach--the author), "is violent reaction on the part of the rich against the development which is undergoing its 'peaceful stage,' and the objective of this reaction is to prevent subsequent 'violent' conflicts; it is a combat call for violent counterrevolution against 'peaceful' development. Actually, the government is trying to suppress through violence a development which it finds unsuitable yet which, from the legal viewpoint, is unassailable. This is what leads to a violent revolution" (vol 45, pp 142-143).

As we can see, even during Marx's lifetime, in Bismarck's chancery and on the governmental level, precisely the same obvious lie currently promoted by contemporary anticommunism, 100 years after the death of the originator of the revolutionary science, is being publicly disseminated. Suffice it to compare this with the flood of malicious slander regarding the "hand of Moscow," "the inspiration of international terrorism by the Soviets," and the growing danger of "Marxist dictatorships" as "concentrations of evil" one reads in the official addresses by highly placed members of the U.S. administration, including the President.

Yes, it is precisely the counterrevolution, and the reactionary attempts to suppress by the force of arms the peaceful and legitimate movement of the oppressed class that ascribe to the revolution a violent form, leading it into the path of armed struggle.

Let us say a couple of words about Engels' position. Naturally, here again it does not differ from that of Marx however hard the falsifiers are trying to present matters otherwise. His views are described in their most concentrated fashion in the following excerpt of his letter to H. Trier, dated 18 December 1889: "...The proletariat cannot gain political domination--the only gate leading to the new society--without a violent revolution" (vol 37, p 275).

By the turn of the 20th century, in the epoch of imperialism, the centralized military-bureaucratic state machines with their tremendous potential for class suppression were developed, as Lenin proved, in all advanced capitalist countries. However, even this did not mean any kind of rejection (including Russia) of a peaceful transition to socialism as being most preferable. Lenin wrote about this even before the victory of the October Revolution as a "possibility extremely rare in history," but also "extremely valuable." He emphasized the duty of the revolutionaries to use it "even if it is one chance out of a hundred" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 34, p 135). Lenin predicted the increase of such opportunities following the first victories of socialist revolutions, under the conditions of the strengthened positions of socialism in the world and the weakening of imperialism.

Lenin not only predicted but, after February 1917, when czarism was overthrown in Russia, between March and June (and once again in September) he guided the bolsheviks toward the development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist revolution, peacefully, without an armed uprising and bloodshed, through the soviets. However, the counterrevolutionary actions, the firing at a peaceful demonstration in July and the objective changes in the political situation in the country forced the party, at its Sixth Congress, on Lenin's suggestion, to change its previous political course and to direct the working class toward an armed uprising. It was the support of the domestic counterrevolution from the outside and the foreign intervention that led to the outbreak of the civil war.

Today the historical conditions are essentially different. Real socialism and the global change in the ratio of forces in its favor have enabled the international communist movement to substantiate the conclusion of the expansion today of the possibility of conversion to socialism peacefully. The basic solution to the problem which Marx found and which Lenin developed has thus become fully confirmed.

II

What obviously follows from the works of Marx and Engels is the following: the acknowledgment of the historical necessity of the dictatorship of the proletariat--the power of the working class supported by the other strata of the toiling population--is the cornerstone of Marxism as a political-state form of transition from capitalism to socialism. This is a mandatory prerequisite for the victory of socialism. "...It is precisely this that constitutes the essence of Marx's theory...", Lenin pointed out (op. cit., vol 37, p 241).

In their efforts to separate the dictatorship of the proletariat from "Marx's doctrine," the authors of this falsifying encyclopedia claim, in a number of articles, that being a "democratic revolutionary," and unlike Lenin, who was the "supporter of violence," in the course of time Marx abandoned violence. M. Rhubel, the author of the article on Marx, pits "the theory of the dictatorship by the majority of the proletariat, so persistently explained by Marx," against an alleged "Blanquist viewpoint" expressed by Lenin, "which was opposed by Marx and Engels and which defended the dictatorship of the minority, of the party." Thus, we see the class pitted against the party. In the article by Leonhard, the head "Sovietological" expert on proletarian dictatorship, the latter is considered only as an "idea" "which Marx and Engels mentioned only sporadically, but which was developed in detail by Lenin into a political doctrine, "on the basis of a few incidental remarks by Marx and Engels."

Each article within this work has a specific political target. In the Leonhard case, for example, the meaning, the purpose of his article is a base attempt with references to "Marx himself" (and Engels) to substantiate the bourgeois rejection of the dictatorship of the proletariat and to prove that a Marxist-Leninist theory neither should nor would be able to "become a universal guiding star for the communists of all countries," to cite the article's concluding statement.

That is why, fully in accord with the traditions which can be traced back to Bernstein and Kautsky, this encyclopedia of anticommunism instills in the Western reader the idea that "Marx and Engels did not provide any kind of systematic presentation of the doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat but limited themselves to individual statements scattered among their various works."

Suffice it to turn to the prime sources of scientific communism to realize the absolute groundlessness of the claims made by the falsifiers. Any unprejudiced person familiar with the works of Marx and Engels could decide for himself whether or not their writings on the dictatorship of the proletariat are accidental statements by merely addressing himself to the "Communist Party Manifesto," which is literally imbued with this idea, Marx's "Civil War in France" and Engels' "Introduction" to this work in which we find a "consistent and systematic presentation" and, above all, a thorough study of the experience and lessons of the Paris Commune as the first specific historical form of proletarian power!

The historical need for the dictatorship of the working class is explained by the fact that the implementation and completion of socialist changes becomes impossible, for the bourgeoisie will always "fiercely resist" that which Marx described in "Das Kapital" as the "expropriation of the expropriators" (see V. I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 37, p 104). The dictatorship of the proletariat is the most important political prerequisite for socialism.

The "Communist Party Manifesto" itself had already proved that the socialization and concentration of basic productive capital in the hands of the proletarian state "naturally, could take place initially only with the help

of a despotic interference in the right of ownership under bourgeois production relations as well, i.e., through measures which may economically seem insufficient and inadequate but which, in the course of their dynamics, outstrip their own importance and become inevitable as a means for transformation in all production methods. Such measures, naturally, will differ from country to country" (vol 4, p 446). After enumerating some basic points in the program which the working class should carry out following its ascension to power, the authors of the "Manifesto" draw the following general conclusion: "Through revolution...as the ruling class, the proletariat will eliminate the old production relations" (ibid., p 447). Unquestionably, this is a question of the revolutionary force of the armed and state-organized proletariat, the weapon of its "despotic interference" in ownership relations. This clearly stems from all subsequent works of Marx and Engels. "...If the victorious party is unwilling to lose the results of its efforts, it must retain its rule through the same fear which it instills in the reactionaries with its weapons," Engels noted in his article "On Authority" (1872-1873), drawing attention to the fact that the Paris Commune "made excessively little use of this authority" (vol 18, p 305).

Historical experience, even the latest--Cuba, Vietnam, Ethiopia, Angola, Nicaragua and Afghanistan--convincingly proves that freedom, democracy and socialism can be guaranteed only through the inflexible resolve of the people to defend, arms in hand, the gains of the revolution and international proletarian solidarity.

Like Marx, Lenin considered that the essence of the dictatorship of the proletariat did not lie in the least or mainly in simple violence but in the political leadership of the masses of toiling people building a new society. Each Leninist definition, taken in context, naturally, emphasizes the revolutionary-creative and constructive task of the power of the working class. This power--a manifestation of true democracy--is a democracy of a superior type, a democracy for the majority, for the people, a democracy which leads to the state of the whole people and to social self-administration.

"The conversion of the proletariat into a ruling class" also means "the acquisition of democracy." These words which stand out in the "Communist Party Manifesto" are no paradox. They scientifically express a most profound dialectics. The essential feature of the proletarian movement is that it is an "autonomous movement by a tremendous majority in the interest of that tremendous majority" (vol 4, p 435). The revolutionary intervention of the victorious proletariat in the area of ownership rights, i.e., that which Marx described in "Das Kapital" as the "expropriation of the expropriators," is a necessary material prerequisite for true democracy.

As to the main features which Marx contributed to the science of society, he particularly emphasized the radical distinction which existed between his views and all previous trends in social thinking, even the most progressive and profound. It was "proving the following: 1) that the existence of classes is related only to specific historical phases in production development; 2) that the class struggle must by necessity lead to a dictatorship of the proletariat; 3) that this dictatorship itself is merely a transition to

the elimination of all classes and to a society without classes" (vol 28, p 427). "A Marxist," Lenin emphasized, "is only he who extends this acknowledgment of the class struggle to the acknowledgment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is the most profound distinction between a Marxist and the ordinary petit (or even big) bourgeois. This is the touchstone on which we must test the real understanding and acknowledgment of Marxism" (op. cit., vol 33, p 34).

Marx persistently developed this concept literally to the very last days of his life. A most important concept was formulated in the "Critique of the Gotha Program," which became a guide to the party of the working class: the inevitability--as a particular historical stage--of a transitional period from capitalism to socialism, which is the first phase of communism: "A period of revolutionary transformation of the former to the latter rests between the capitalist and the communist society. Consistent with this period is a politically transitional period. During that period the state can be nothing other than a revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat" (vol 19, p 27). It is in this formula that Marx's theory of the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat obtained its further development and, in a certain sense, its logical conclusion.

The works of the founders of Marxism (including those written by Engels after Marx's death) are an irrefutable argument against the current Bernsteinians and "keep proving" that toward the end of their lives Marx and Engels reviewed their previous revolutionary views and just about converted to their "contemporary revisionist" positions and "non-Marxist interpretations."

Long before the first victorious socialist revolution, Marx and Engels substantiated the historical necessity of the power of the working class and the dictatorship of the proletariat, and brought to light its class nature and profoundly democratic content, its tasks and its essential opposition to any form of bourgeois power, as well as its transitional nature. This theory was developed by them throughout their lives, for half a century, from 1845 to 1895. Proclaiming everything they have written concerning the dictatorship of the proletariat as a "petty word" (or, which is one and the same, "individual casual statements), as Lenin proved with the Kautsky example, means the rejection of Marxism (see op. cit., vol 37, pp 241-242).

As we know, it was Bernstein who became the "spokesman for the rejection" of the principle of proletarian dictatorship, and who also objected to the term itself. He proclaimed the "class dictatorship" under "democratic" (bourgeois, naturally) conditions "political atavism." "In the social democratic parties in the West," wrote Leonhard in the "comparative encyclopedia," on this subject, the only place where we could agree with them is the point at which they entirely abandon the dictatorship of the proletariat as a target in both practice and theory, whereas the communist movement...has made the dictatorship of the proletariat its main target." By this token, however, according to the "Sovietologists," "it has adapted this idea to its own conditions and aspirations," which allegedly has entailed its "significant transformation."

Here is a model of falsifying logic: "The total rejection" of proletarian dictatorship as a programmatic principle ("as a practical or theoretical

objective") is presented as..."Marxism," pitted against "communism." The refusal to heed Bernstein as the "spokesman of rejection," and the refusal to adapt Marxism to the shape of the bourgeoisie is considered, according to that same logic, as the "adaptation" of theory "to one's own conditions and aspirations," and its "significant change." We face here a clear distortion of concepts and substitutions of the essence and content of the matter.

Naturally, what essentially matters is not the use or the nonuse of the term "dictatorship of the proletariat," which appeared in 1848 as the combat slogan of the fighting workers on the June barricades in Paris and was introduced into political and scientific circulation by Marx. The essence is to implement this basic principle of scientific communism. It is a question of the class content of the governmental system rather than the form or characteristics of one political institution or another. As long as antagonistic classes remain, the state remains a tool of class domination. It is only through the weapon of the revolutionary state--the state of a new type which, at the initial stage of building a new society, acts as a dictatorship of the proletariat while subsequently, as Soviet experience has indicated, grows into a state of the whole people, that the historical objectives of the working class can be accomplished and the basic interests of all toiling strata met.

Opportunism relies on changing circumstances. In its view, the change of conditions does not require improvements in theory but its revision and substitution.

Marx's theory of a socialist revolution and dictatorship of the proletariat, which was rejected by the opportunists as early as the end of the 19th century, gained a second life in the 20th century and was suitably continued and profoundly developed in Lenin's works and in the revolutionary practices of the millions-strong masses and through the entire historical experience which proved that socialism cannot be accomplished without revolutions and without a political guidance of society by the working class, headed by the communist party. For many years and even decades social democratic, labor and other governments have headed or are heading a number of bourgeois countries. However, even under such circumstances class exploitation, economic crises, unemployment, and the insecurity of the life of the working people, i.e., features which affect the very foundations of capitalism, are not eliminated.

It is precisely the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat which ensured the transformation of the USSR into a powerful state of developed socialism, with a powerful industrial and scientific and technical potential, a dynamic and stable growth, a high and steadily rising material and cultural standard of the people. It was precisely they which became the prerequisite for the impressive accomplishments of the other socialist countries.

Today there is no Marxism outside or despite Leninism. It is only on the basis of the ideas of the founders of scientific communism, of the communist party, the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, enriched by Lenin, that Marx's theory of the revolutionary conversion from

capitalism to socialism could be applied in practice. Leninism gave a real strength to the truly democratic movements throughout the world, regardless of their place of origin. The political domination by the working class or proletarian dictatorship, to repeat Engels' apt statement, is "the only gate leading to the new society."

III

One of the central strategic points in which the class enemy is fiercely attacking Marxism-Leninism and is "looking for contradictions" and "differences" between Lenin and Marx is the theory of the communist party. Innumerable statements of all kinds have been formulated to the effect that "according to Marx" the subject of the socialist revolution is the class whereas "according to Lenin," it is the party, and that he assigned to the party a task the implementation of which Marx had assigned exclusively to the working class, that Marx had said nothing as to whether or not the party will be a leading force whereas Lenin had raised the idea of an elitist party, that the party of a new type is, furthermore, a conspiratorial organization, and so, and so forth. These are patently false and artificially structured contradictions!

The thesis of the purely Leninist "nonclassical" idea "introduced" into Marxism is systematically run through the entire concept of the "comparative encyclopedia," volume after volume and article after article. The idea of the party, it states, "was alien to Marx but was consistent with Russian revolutionary tradition" and Lenin "linked" the revolution "with the concept of the leading role of a revolutionary elite." This is claimed in terms of Engels as well. In reality, there is nothing more alien than similar claims as compared to the true use expressed by Marx and Engels (as well as Lenin).

The subject of the socialist revolution, the class force which acts as its material and intellectual executor is, according to Marx and Lenin, the proletariat. "The main feature in Marx's theory is the explanation of the universal-historical role of the proletariat as the builder of a socialist society" (V. I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 23, p 1). However, the working class can implement this noble role only with the existence of a political vanguard, a revolutionary party which relies on the wide support of the class and the awareness and unity of the masses which follow it (see vol 17, p 427). Marxism-Leninism does not allow any substitution of revolutionary action by a class as the subject of a revolution with the activities of merely its political vanguard, the party, not to mention the activeness of any party segment. Socialism "can be achieved only as a result of the revolutionary action of the class of producers--or the proletariat--organized as an autonomous political party; ...Such an organization must be achieved by all possible means at the disposal of the proletariat" (vol 19, p 246).

The "idea of a party" may be traced to the very first mature Marxist works. It is one of the most important, basic and most general Marxist conclusions. A party is necessary so that the working class may realize its own revolutionary vocation, interests and tasks, organize itself and head the struggle of the masses for overthrowing the domination of capital and building a

communist society. The party is a mandatory prerequisite for the conversion of the "class within itself" into a "class for itself." It is a decisive factor for victory in the class struggle. The party is not an artificial creation as a result of any kind of theory or by any kind of sect. It is not a result of the work of conspirators or putschists. It is a product of the self-growth of the proletarian movement which, in turn, is created by the objective and natural historical trends of capitalism. The appearance of a revolutionary Marxist party in any country is the natural, the legitimate result of historical progress and the struggle of the working class for its vital interests and rights, for social and national liberation and for freedom and true independence.

Defining the place and significance of the communist party in the revolutionary struggle and in building the new society is an organic segment of Marx's theory, clearly confirmed by the entire historical development. This, however, hardly matters to the authors of the "comparative encyclopedia!" Totally undisturbed, they write: "It is interesting that in all of their statements on the subject of the dictatorship of the proletariat Marx and Engels never mention a political party, not to speak of its 'leading role.'"

What is interesting in this claim is the very method through which the "Sovietological experts" mislead the reader, for any "mention of a political party, not to speak of its 'leading role,'" as well as the mention of the dictatorship of the proletariat may be found precisely in the works by the founders of Marxism which are universally known as communist party documents.

Such documents include not only the "Communist Party Manifesto." They also apply to "Remarks on the Program of the German Worker Party," which is entitled "Critique of the Gotha Program," aimed above all at the "party friends" in the leadership of the Eisenach party, the "Introduction to the Program of the French Worker Party," "The Civil War in France," the appeal of the General Council of the International Association of Workers, the "Principles of Communism," the draft program of the Union of Communists and, finally, "On the Critique of the Draft Social Democratic Program of 1891," a work addressed to the board of the German Social Democratic Party.

Let us consider the parts which deal with the party in the documents of the communist movement drafted by Marx and Engels.

The lessons of the Paris Commune entirely confirmed the thesis contained in the "Communist Party Manifesto" to the effect that the victory of socialism is impossible without a mass proletarian party, based on the principles of scientific communism and acting as the recipient of the political experience of the working class. The Communards had no such party, which was one of the main reasons for their defeat. This conclusion was reflected in the resolution adopted at the Ninth London Conference of the International Association of Workers (the First International) "On the Political Action of the Working Class." One year later, by decision of the Hague Congress, an article which expressed the basic Marxist principle was included in the bylaws of the International: "In its struggle against the combined power of the rich classes, the working class can act as such only if it is organized in a separate political party opposing all the old parties created by the property-owning

classes. Such an organization of the working class into a political party is necessary in order to ensure the victory of the socialist revolution and help to attain its end objective--the elimination of classes" (vol 18, p 143).

Subsequently Marx and Engels substantially developed a number of aspects of party theory. In 1875 they most firmly opposed the attempts to unify the German social democrats on the basis of a "compromise" between Marxism and Lassallianism, thus pitting against opportunism the revolutionary concept of a proletarian party (see vol 19, pp 1-32). During the 1880s and 1890s Engels most firmly supported the existence of a proletarian party. This includes his criticism of the Erfurt program of the German Social Democratic Party.

In 1889, after Marx's death, Engels reemphasized that "in order for the proletariat to prove to be sufficiently strong at the decisive moment and be able to win, as Marx and I have supported this view since 1847, it must set up its own party, separate from all others and opposing them, a party which considers itself a class party." The class content of the policy of the proletarian party, he went on to say, was that any political action may be taken only "providing that the proletarian class nature of the party is not questioned thereby. To me this is a mandatory prerequisite. You will find a presentation of this policy in the Communist Manifesto, formulated as early as 1847. We have pursued it since 1848 through the International and everywhere" (vol 37, p 275). In a word, without a proletarian party aware of its class nature and opposing all bourgeois parties, there is neither a victory for the revolution nor for socialism. This principle is diametrically opposed to what the falsifiers are trying to prove and literally imbues the entire theoretical and practical activities of Marx and Engels.

"...In order to achieve victory and destroy the foundations of the capitalist society you need the active support of a socialist party which must be stronger, more numerous, better-armed and more conscious compared to the one you have," Engels explained in his letter to P. Lafargue, one of the leaders of the French Workers Party, dated 2 June 1894. "This would lead to the implementation of what we predicted and anticipated many years ago: the French will give the signal and open fire while the Germans will decide the outcome of the struggle" (vol 39, p 215). (Let us recall that in a number of works by Marx and Engels, such as the "Preface" to the second Russian edition of the "Communist Party Manifesto" of 1882 we find the conviction that the revolution in Russia "will be the signal"). Less than 10 years remained until a party of the working class meeting such a requirement was to be organized.

The first time such a party was created was in Russia, in 1903. The Marxist party of a new type is qualitatively different: it is stronger, more popular, better tested, more conscientious and mature than any party which the proletariat had at its disposal until then. The historical arena was entered by a party inseparably blended with the working class, intolerant of opportunism and capable of heading the revolutionary struggle on a scientifically substantiated basis. Three revolutions lay ahead. The founding of the Bolshevik Party and the establishment of Leninism as a political and ideological trend were the legitimate results of social development, and a turning point not only in the Russian but in the entire global liberation movement.

"I enclose Bebel's letter which I received today," Engels wrote to Marx on 30 November 1882, shortly before Marx's death. The "mystical aspect," which he was not able to understand immediately and which could have rescued them (the German Social Democrats--the author) from the effects of the law against the socialists is, naturally, an outbreak of a revolutionary crisis in Russia. Amazingly, all these people have been unable to become accustomed to the idea that the impetus may come from there. Yet I precisely have frequently explained this to Bebel" (vol 35, p 99).

It was not only "all of these people" which the founders of scientific communism specifically referred to. The ideological heirs of Kautsky and Bernstein are today equally unable to realize, to acknowledge the entire significance and the historical truth of this thought. Furthermore, many of them, including the authors of the "comparative encyclopedia," accuse Lenin and the bolsheviks of no more and no less than...betrayal of Marxism, of "revisionism!" Yet it was precisely as a result of the revolutionary initiative and energy of the latter that the revolutionary action predicted by Marx and Engels became an objective fact.

Marx, however, was right, and so was Engels: Russia "gave the signal." It also "opened fire." It was again there, thanks to the leadership of the masses by a purely proletarian party, that the victory was secured, the outcome of the struggle decided and the foundations of the capitalist system eliminated. This marked the creation of essentially new conditions for the development of the revolutionary process, both east and west.

On the eve of the October Revolution Lenin wrote that "what is taking place with Marx's theory is something which has frequently occurred in the history of the doctrines of revolutionary thinkers and leaders of the oppressed classes in the struggle for the liberation. While the great revolutionaries were alive the oppressing classes subjected them to constant persecution and reacted to their doctrine with the most savage malice, the most raging hatred, the most reckless campaign of lies and slanders. Following their death, attempts were made to convert them into harmless icons, to canonize them, so to say, and to allow some of their glory to be used in "consoling" the oppressed classes and stupefying them, by emasculating the content of the revolutionary doctrine, dulling its revolutionary wedge and debasing it. Today the bourgeoisie and the opportunists within the labor movement agree on such a "treatment" of Marxism. They eliminate, they delete, they distort the revolutionary aspect of the doctrine, its revolutionary soul. They give priority, they praise that which is or seems acceptable to the bourgeoisie (op. cit., vol 33, p 5).

This was written more than 50 years before the publication of this encyclopedia of contemporary anticommunism. Lenin's words, however, remain equally relevant today: the "treatment" of Marx's theory by the falsifiers and their attempts to turn it into a harmless icon is continuing with growing intensity. Our ideological opponents are forced to resort to this as a result of the universal-historical victories of Marx's great cause.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/6

MOSCOW STATE UNIVERSITY PARTY CONFERENCE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 83 (signed to press 13 Dec 83) pp 19-30

[Article by V. Arkhipenko]

[Text] Cybernetics and philology experts, mathematicians, journalists, chemists, jurists, physicists, philosophers, geologists, economists, biologists, historians, geographers, psychologists, astronomers and soil experts sat side by side in the hall where the conference was taking place. Next to grey-haired, famous scientists sat first-semester students. Sports jackets alternated with conservative suits and badges of student construction detachments alternated with badges of part veterans and battle medals.

The delegates gathered in the palace of culture of MGU [Moscow State University] were the representatives of the 8,000-strong party organization of the country's largest VUZ. Moscow University numbers more than 60,000 people. They include more than 26,000 students and 4,000 graduate students. More than 2,000 foreign citizens from 90 countries are enrolled in the university. Some 8,000 teachers and scientific associates in all possible areas of contemporary science work in its departments, chairs and institutes. The very composition of the delegates reflected the professional variety of the university's collective and its party organization. However, the disparity in scientific interests did not hinder in the least their joint involvement in the problems discussed, which were not lacking at the conference. The direction, tone and mood of the discussions were given by the report submitted by the party committee in which the results of accomplishments and directions in future work were brought to light in accordance with the strict party requirements. The conference discussed, above all, the implementation of the resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the subsequent plenums of its Central Committee. The most important trend in the period under consideration was the implementation of the tasks formulated at the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum which, as the party committee report noted, played an exceptionally important role in defining the future development of Soviet society. The university communists are trying to resolve more rapidly and successfully the problems set by the plenum of upgrading cadre responsibility on all work levels, struggling against any violations of party, state and labor discipline and ensuring the better utilization of reserves for economic progress.

The report described the most important trends in the activities of the party committee and the entire university party organization during the period

under consideration. It described the way critical remarks and suggestions expressed by the party members at the previous accountability and election conference had been taken into consideration and defined the tasks related to the collective's further socioeconomic development.

The report submitted by the MGU party committee was discussed in a business-like atmosphere, on the basis of party principle-mindedness. The delegates earmarked the ways to resolve current and long-term problems and to improve organizational and ideological-political and educational work. A number of important problems were raised at the conference. Particular attention was paid, however, to the prime direction followed by the collective--the path of further advancement of university education and, on this basis, improving the quality of specialists for the country's national economy and enhancing the effectiveness of scientific research.

I

Moscow State University imeni M. V. Lomonosov is the pride of domestic science. A number of works of universal significance have been created by MGU scientists. During the Soviet period they developed new trends in mathematics, physics, biology, chemistry, geology and other basic sciences. The finds of MGU archeologists in ancient Novgorod and the achievements of the university's psychologists are widely known. The following fact proves the importance of the contribution by MGU scientists to science: 10 percent of all scientific discoveries made in our country under the Soviet system originated at Moscow University.

Continuing the great traditions, the present-day scientists at MGU remain in the leading positions of scientific development. They learn the reasons for the appearance of galaxies and the laws governing the existence of elementary particles and living cells; they penetrate the unknown depths of the earth and of outer space. They are engaged in most topical studies, the results of which are substantially accelerating the pace of the scientific and technical revolution. The work of the physics faculty was described at the conference as an example of high efficiency of scientific research. B. S. Ishkhanov, party committee secretary of the physics faculty, reported at the conference that during the period under consideration alone one-of-a-kind laser equipment was developed for the study of explosions, supersonic flows and solid plasma; foundations were developed for a technology for the production of materials with preprogrammed features; mathematical methods were developed for processing images obtained from satellites and space stations and for controlling the quality of microelectronic goods. One week before the party conference a discovery by the physics faculty scientists was officially registered. It will enable them to search more reliably for minerals, to forecast earthquakes and to sound distant planets.

The volume of basic and applied research is expanding with every passing year and its national economic significance is growing. The delegates were told that during the period under consideration seven MGU scientists had been awarded the Lenin Prize and 55 the USSR State Prize. Twenty-three patents and about 600 ownership certificates had been issued for development and

inventions made in university departments; nine discoveries had been recorded in the state register.

"The party organization and the rectorate," said E. D. Yershov, dean of the geological faculty, "are always concentrating on the main problems of upgrading the economical and efficient nature of scientific research and the training process. One of these systematically resolved problems is the concentration of MGU scientific forces on the study of the most important theoretical and national economic problems, and upgrading the efficiency of scientific research. Results and practical utilizations have improved."

The university's collective is participating in the development and implementation of 50 most important target and scientific and technical state programs of tremendous national economic significance. Their implementation will enable us to make use of the latest achievements of science and technology in upgrading production efficiency and quality of output and to create essentially new types of equipment and technology. The savings resulting from the application of such studies have totaled in the tens of millions of rubles over the past 3 years.

Special scientific work is being done based on economic contracts. As delegates pointed out at the conference, it is important for each project to be the organic extension of basic research and clearly oriented toward significant end results.

Accomplishments based on cooperation contracts between the collective and various enterprises and organizations are distinguished by their high-level efficiency. For nearly 10 years the university has been cooperating with the famous collective of the ZIL, the automotive giant. During the period under consideration MGU personnel helped to develop new laboratories at the plant, to apply modern methods for machining parts and to upgrade the use of computers in automation, design and control systems.

Cooperation contracts have also been signed with dozens of medical institutions throughout the country. The results of a number of joint studies have been applied in practical health care. The developers of new, highly effective medicinal drugs were awarded the 1982 Lenin Prize.

The MGU collective has actively joined in the implementation of the Food Program. In 1982, on the initiative of the party committee and the rectorate an MGU staff was created for its implementation, which is coordinating the efforts of the various departments engaged in comprehensive studies. A number of faculties and institutes are participating in the programs related to power industry problems. Obviously, the time has come to organize centralized university-wide control over scientific work in this area.

The collectives of most faculties, institutes, chairs and laboratories have become involved in the solution of the most important socioeconomic problems of Moscow's development. They have already contributed major practical assistance in the development of a number of economic sectors.

The consolidation of scientific topics and conversion to program-target planning are characteristic for both the natural sciences and the humanities. The social scientists are engaged in the comprehensive development of key problems such as ways of advancing developed socialism, strengthening the world socialist system and the world revolutionary movement, developing planning methods and control systems, and elaborating the scientific foundations of the shaping of the new man. The collective scientific works produced by scientists in the humanities departments, including the two-volume "Russian Grammar," six volumes of the "Outlines of 13th-17th-Century Russian Culture," a cycle of works on reserves for upgrading the people's well-being and on the theory and practice of industrial psychology met with great public response. The series "History and Methodology of the Natural Sciences," 30 volumes of which have been published so far, starting with 1960, has developed as a major contribution to the social sciences.

Although the activities of the social scientists were suitably rated at the conference, the delegates noted that the yields of such a truly tremendous scientific potential available at MGU could have been considerably greater. The university party committee and the party committees of the departments have not organized with sufficient efficiency the implementation of the resolutions of the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. The party demands of the social scientists to energize their creative work and to see to it that the results of scientific research turn into significant recommendations for practical use and that developing trends be identified promptly and the course of events projected more accurately.

Work is being done on a number of levels in the humanities department, aimed at the implementation of the party's requirements. In his address at the conference I. D. Koval'chenko, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member and chair head at the history department, said:

"Guided by the resolutions of the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum, the representatives of the social and humanitarian sciences are analyzing the situation in their scientific areas and the level of professional and ideological-theoretical training of social science cadres in order to define specific means for improving their entire work."

It was emphasized at the conference that the ideological-theoretical standard and practical significance of studies in the area of the social sciences must be enhanced and that imminent theoretical problems must be developed more energetically.

In pursuing this direction in their work, the university social scientists must rely more extensively on the stipulations and conclusions contained in Comrade Yu. V. Andropov's article "Karl Marx's Teachings and Some Problems of Socialist Construction in the USSR," and his addresses at the November 1982 and June 1983 CPSU Central Committee plenums, which are models of creative approach to the elaboration of the theory of scientific communism.

In their addresses the delegates raised the question of improving the material and technical support of scientific research. A great deal has been

accomplished in this respect during the period under consideration. All in all, the speed of computer operations at the present time has reached a total of several dozen millions of operations per second.

As a rule, the automation of experimentation radically changes the level of efficiency of scientific work and enables us to resolve previously insoluble problems. Computers are increasingly applied in social science research as well. Moscow University has become the country's leading center in the use of quantitative methods and computers in historical research and the resulting products have earned widespread international recognition.

However, the delegates also pointed out that the new equipment is still not being used to its fullest potential. There is a shortage of servicing specialists. More than 1,500 units of the latest equipment remains stockpiled in MGU warehouses. The speakers drew attention to the major shortcomings in supplying the university with facilities for scientific information and office equipment. The construction of a basic science library has not been started yet, although it was planned some 10 years ago. The delegates suggested to the party committee in its new structure to assume control over such imminent matters.

The delegates emphasized the importance of observing state discipline in science and providing proper party control. The commission in charge of controlling administrative activities in the field of scientific work, set up by the party committee, supervised the course of the implementation of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers Decree "On Upgrading the Efficiency of Scientific Research in Higher Educational Institutions," analyzed the organization of scientific research on earmarked steps to enhance their level and ensure the fastest possible application of results in the national economy. During the period under consideration the party committee discussed the tasks of the rectorate and the party organization in further enhancing the efficiency of scientific research in the light of the resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress. The lines to be followed in the better utilization of the great scientific potential of the collective in basic research and reducing the time for the practical application of scientific developments were defined.

Although they assessed positively the practices of the party's leadership in the organization of scientific research, the delegates noted the need steadily to improve this work. At the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum Comrade Yu. V. Andropov spoke of the basic problems of upgrading the efficiency of our country's economy. We face production automation, ensuring the widest possible application of computers and robots, installing flexible technology, and resolving problems related to biotechnology, obtaining materials with predetermined characteristics, and applying waste-free and energy-conserving technological processes.

MGU personnel as well will participate in resolving all these problems. The university party organizations have the duty to energize their activities and control on a daily basis the course of implementation of the most important state orders. They must find and mobilize reserves for the fastest possible practical application of the results of scientific research.

Moscow University is justifiably considered the country's leading center in training specialists in industry, agriculture, science and culture. Under the Soviet system it has trained more than 180,000 people. Today as well, at the end of the school year, thousands of graduates will be assigned to various parts of the country.

However, this is not merely a question of quantity, although in itself this side of the matter is impressive. The most important is the qualitative aspect of training, for the real contribution which a specialist could make to the national economy depends on the level he has reached, his knowledge, his ability to apply it and his rapid orientation in the rush of conflicts in the developments of science and technology as well as his ability always to reach out to the new. Those who spoke at the conference said that it is precisely the skilled and experienced MGU collective which could formulate and implement a progressive concept for training specialists, which would be entirely consistent with practical requirements. Here it should be a question of not substituting strictly professional for serious academic training. We must find ways for a more efficient combination of fundamental with applied knowledge and develop in the students the taste and skills for resolving practical problems.

The training of students is a steadily updated and increasingly more complex process. The system of VUZ training, developed over decades, required, under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution, unusual and non-traditional decisions, a different organization and new means. The reorganization, which began in the 1960s, after covering the stage of research, successful and unsuccessful experimentation, and the testing of a variety of methods, lifted the training process to a higher stage. Contemporary mathematical methods, technologies, lasers and display equipment based on new principles and many others are currently extensively used in the lecture halls. It would be no exaggeration to say that electronics today runs through the entire training process. As was noted at the conference, the use of computers made it possible to develop automatic training systems and information subsystems for the school complex. All of this led to qualitative changes in specialist training.

Characteristically, three-quarters of MGU students are involved in the scientific research work of their departments and participate in projects based on economic contracts or are engaged in independent research. The students are making their contribution to improving production facilities at the ZIL Association and are resolving technical problems for the BAM.

Along with its unquestionable accomplishments, the reorganization of the training process was not completed without casualties as well. Speakers at the conference discussed with concern the withdrawal of some leading workers from direct teaching activities. They avoid teaching courses or holding seminars. The conference noted as a negative phenomenon the fact that today a considerable percentage of the lectures are delivered not by professors but by docents, instructors, scientific associates and teaching assistants. The

question was accurately raised as to steps which could be taken to change the situation. This involves improving the moral and material incentives for lecturing scientists. The suggestion that the Lomonosov Prize be awarded to scientists who have developed one-of-a-kind lecture courses was received with approval.

One of the main trends in the activities of the party organization at MGU, as was noted at the conference, has been to enhance the quality of the training and to advance the training process. In formulating measures which are contributing to the fastest possible application of the new ways and means of training, the party committee relied on the stipulations formulated in the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On the Further Development of the Higher School and on Upgrading the Quality of Specialists' Training." The party committee MGU commission in charge of controlling administrative activities in charge of training-method work played an important role in the conversion of the faculties to the new curriculae, which was completed in 1983. On its suggestion the program of basic courses was reviewed faster and completed successfully in accordance with the latest achievements of science and the steadily increasing requirements facing the specialists graduating from the university.

The improvements of the training process greatly increased the class load of the students. The previous, 31st Accountability and Election Party Conference at MGU had already drawn attention to this. Following the recommendation of the party committee commission the necessary changes were made in the new curriculums so that the students were given the opportunity to work more on their own.

Serious critical remarks were made at the conference on the material and technical support of the training process. It was noted, in particular, that the availability of books and periodicals for use by the students is sometimes lower compared to some foreign universities, that we do not as yet make adequate use of the automated control system, a magnet [magnitnyy] control, duplication equipment and many other facilities which ease the training process.

Objective reasons can be cited for the delayed construction of the basic sciences library or the inadequate availability of the latest displays in a department. It is more difficult to understand the reason for which textbooks and training aids are not available for all training courses. For example, there is not even a single textbook for the two-semester course on "Philosophical Problems in the Natural Sciences." And even the articles and monographs which could be used in the study of this course are either available in the library in single copies or not available at all.

A certain contradiction has developed between the updated training methods and the old organizational forms as a result of the restructuring of the training process. According to the participants in the conference it could be resolved by enhancing the role and significance of student groups.

S. S. Kravchuk, law school consulting professor, party member since March 1917, and delegate to the conference, pointed out that at the meeting with

the veterans held at the CPSU Central Committee the question of the need to raise young people in a spirit of trust and give them responsible assignments was discussed.

"Under university conditions," the veterans said, "the responsibility of the students themselves for school discipline and grades must be enhanced. Our students have too many petty supervisors. However, it is precisely every individual student who must know that he above all is personally responsible for discipline and good grades. In the struggle for strengthening discipline and improving grades we must intensify the role of school groups and their elders and the party, Komsomol and trade union organizers."

A number of speakers discussed matters related to enhancing the responsibility of the students and the student group and the development of voluntary principles and self-management. The idea was expressed that the student group could take over the allocation of scholarships, which is such an important tool for influence. The current system forces some students to achieve high grades by all possible means without, however, encouraging the acquisition of profound and durable knowledge. Furthermore, it is precisely through the group that a differentiated approach could be organized in terms of the size of the scholarship, based on the material situation of the student and his "labor participation coefficient" in training and scientific research.

A variety of components are closely interwoven in the complex and many-faceted process of training a specialist: the talent and knowledge of the scientific manager, years of organized and developing organization of training, the psychological and moral climate in the collective, the level of educational work, working and living conditions, the existence and quality of technical means of training, and many others. These problems as well were discussed at the conference.

In its efforts to improve the training-education and methodical work and to improve all levels of the cadre training system, the party organization pays particular attention to the question of MGU enrollment. The quality of the future specialists largely depends on the level of knowledge of the new reinforcements and the abilities and moral foundations of the new students. In recent years, however, it is precisely such reinforcement that has been a subject of growing criticism. Quite frequently the level of training which the young men and women acquire in secondary schools proves to be low, particularly in subjects such as mathematics, physics and history. Instead of continuing with the training of yesterday's secondary school students, in a number of cases they must undergo retraining. Another factor which has affected the new students is the reduced difficulty of the competition, particularly in the natural sciences, which has narrowed the selection possibilities. We are also concerned by a certain decline in the share of worker and rural youth among the freshmen.

The university party committee, taking the critical remarks expressed at the previous accountability and election conference into consideration, set up a commission to earmark ways to resolve the problem. The commission sponsored a training-method conference on new enrollment. Teachers began to visit more

frequently enterprises and establishments, military units and secondary schools, where they read lectures and talked about MGU and the scientific research in which it is engaged. Regular meetings are being held with young workers, kolkhoz members and soldiers. The university has preparatory departments and courses, circles and courses for the young. Subject competitions are held at 14 departments, in which tens of thousands of school students participate. Open-door days are also traditional at the university.

The result has been a halt in the decline in competition applications for the natural sciences departments (in 1983 it was 3.7 candidates per vacancy) and a somewhat enhanced competition for the humanities. The quality indicators for freshman enrollment have improved. However, shortcomings in the enrollment process have not been eliminated entirely.

The need for taking additional steps to correct the existing situation and to find new and more efficient methods for attracting to MGU the best-trained, most capable young people, loyal to the ideals of the party and the people, was discussed at the conference.

The problems related to improving the selection of young people are closely related to improving the planning of the training and assignment of specialists. The necessary corrections to the recruitment plan were started this school year. In particular, enrollment has been reduced for subjects the needs for which is limited, while the training of cadres in skills the need for which is increasing, particularly in connection with the accelerated development of the national economic sectors which define scientific and technical progress, has been increased.

The MGU party organization is steadily supervising the training of specialists. The conference instructed the new party committee members to continue to concentrate on this side of the work and steadily to encourage improvements in the training process, the growth of its efficiency, improvements in the qualitative structure of the students and the enhanced responsibility of student groups.

The delegates also considered a most important problem for the immediate future, such as helping the planned secondary school reform through the writing of new textbooks and method aids, extensive application of modern technology, microcomputers above all, in the secondary school system and, above all, seeing to it that secondary school teachers become themselves university graduates and consist not of people who have proved to be rather inadequate for teaching in a VUZ or engaging in scientific work but people with a vocation for education, who use skillfully their university training and knowledge and are able to play a vanguard role among their colleagues and set examples in the training and education of secondary school students.

III

Improving the ideological and political-educational work and enhancing its quality are among the most important tasks resolved by the party at the present stage. This was precisely the topic of a substantial part of the

accountability report submitted by the party committee and the same topics were discussed by many of the participants in the conference. On the basis of the resolutions of the 26th Party Congress and the CPSU Central Committee plenums, the delegates analyzed the methodological and conceptual trends of the training process. They considered the situation with the teaching of the social sciences and the ideological and theoretical standards of the scientific studies made by social scientists. The main attention was focused on communist upbringing and shaping a Marxist-Leninist outlook among the future specialists, as well as their exposure to the revolutionary, combat and labor traditions of the Soviet people.

Moscow University has the largest primary Komsomol organization in the country after that of KamAZ. Naturally, one of the main areas of activity of the party committee is to guide it. The department and chair party committees and bureaus analyze on a daily basis the work of the Komsomol organizations and groups, help them in dealing with current affairs and defining their future activities and are concerned with the development of their activeness and initiative. All such problems have been frequently considered at MGU party committee meetings. The party nucleus in the elective Komsomol organs for which young communists who show an inclination for educational work are recommended, is becoming increasingly strong. Every year dozens of Komsomol activists are granted party membership. The patriotic accomplishments of MGU Komsomols are well-known throughout the country--the labor contribution of student detachments in the implementation of the Food Program, the construction of industrial projects in the capital, and help in developing cultural institutions in Nonchernozem villages and virgin land rayons. However, the delegates pointed out that frequently a bureaucratic attitude is encountered in Komsomol work and that many undertakings are carried out formally. The slogan of the university Komsomol, as the party committee report stipulated, should be the following: less formalism and paper shuffling and more specific projects and creative zeal.

During the period under consideration a great deal was accomplished to improve the organizational foundations of communist upbringing. Problems of improving ideological-educational work were regularly discussed at MGU party committee sessions, faculty party organizations and subdivisions. However, as the delegates self-critically pointed out, the quantity of sessions and the number and the ringing sound of the measures have never replaced nor could replace content and results. By far not everything is as it should be in educational work. The large number of violations of public order and rules of socialist community life is a matter of concern.

It was noted at the conference that the communist upbringing of the students is both a varied yet single process inseparably related to their training, independent scientific work and labor and sociopolitical activeness. The party organization, strictly in accordance with the Leninist principle of unity between training and education, making use of the various ways and means of ideological work, tries to shape in the students communist convictions, Soviet civic-mindedness and a lofty patriotic awareness.

The speakers noted the increased interest shown in the social sciences and the works of the Marxist-Leninist classics. Many students are taking part in

competitions on writing scientific works on social science topics. The scientific student conference on the 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR triggered a great deal of interest. It was attended not only by MGU representatives but by delegations from more than 30 VUZs in the country and four foreign universities. Thousands of students are trying to master the skills of lecturing and propaganda work within the framework of the social professions department.

In organizing ideological work among student groups, the party committee relies on students-party members who are active participants in the education process, and who lead their fellow students through their personal example in learning and social work.

Fourth-year philosophy student N. S. Buglenko said the following:

"We, students who are party members, greatly care about the theoretical baggage which the student will take with him when he leaves the university and the skill with which he will work with people and will be an educator and consistent promoter of Marxist-Leninist ideology among the broad toiling masses."

In discussing the increased activeness of the students and their inclination to engage in the profound study of Marxist-Leninist theory, the delegates pointed out shortcomings in teaching the social disciplines. They pointed out that some classes are boring and dull, dealing with abstract problems removed from contemporary life. S. M. Nikitin, MGU Komsomol committee secretary, noted in his address that it may also happen that a student with good grades in socioeconomic subjects shows indifference to politics and even political ignorance in his actions. More than anything else this is an indication of a still-existing gap between words and deeds and abstract memorizing.

The party organization is concerned with the theoretical and professional growth of the faculty and the enhancement of the ideological and theoretical standards of lectures, seminars, textbooks and monographs. The party committee steadily analyzes the work of all 18 university chairs in the social sciences. It controls the content of the lectures and the trends and relevance of scientific research. During the period under consideration the activities of the primary party organization at the Institute for Upgrading the Skill of Social Science Teachers was frequently discussed. This most valuable center for retraining teachers is of the greatest possible importance, for it is precisely here, making use of the tremendous scientific potential of the MGU, that not only all social scientists working in Moscow institutes but those in most VUZs throughout the country must undergo their practical training. Unfortunately, the work of the party members at the institute and their contribution to resolving the problems set at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum were mentioned only briefly at the conference, although it is known that the level of their retraining has remained unsatisfactory to this day.

The speakers noted that the upbringing of the students and the shaping of a scientific outlook and high civic qualities within them is the duty not only

of the social scientist but of all professors and teachers, regardless of their field of specialization. Unfortunately, there still are teachers who consider that their influence on the students is limited to the time assigned for the study of the special disciplines. Some of them are not interested in the students' needs and views and avoid meetings with the young people outside the classroom.

The participants in the conference discussed the need for steady improvements in the selection of teaching cadres. In this matter, the delegates pointed out, one must be guided by the interests of science, training and student upbringing. In addition to the number of works published, the results of the competitions should also take into consideration the actual contribution of the specific teacher to one scientific sector or another, the level of his pedagogical skills and his role in educating the students.

"Under the new conditions," said University Rector A. A. Logunov, "the requirements concerning the personality of the teacher are increasing steadily. The teacher must be a model of reputation in science and pedagogy and in his entire behavior. Unfortunately, this is not always the case. We still have people, including executives, who have a purely formal attitude toward their obligations and show no interest in their work. This is the result of our insufficient exigency in the selection and placement of cadres and, occasionally, poor work with them. It is precisely such shortcomings in our work that lead to the appearance of a variety of negative features in some students, postgraduate students and even associates, such as an unconscientious attitude toward studies and scientific work, and violations of the norms of socialist morality and labor discipline.

There have been cases in which the teachers have committed major infractions of the rules and violated the ethical norms of Soviet higher school educators. Over the past 3 years several educators and scientific associates have been expelled from the party for antisocial and immoral actions. Their behavior has harmed the reputation of Moscow University teachers and the upbringing of the students.

The communist upbringing of MGU associates and students is a multiple-tiered process. The Marxist-Leninist education of the faculty, of the scientific workers, plays an important role. Virtually all known types of party education systems are used at the university, starting with communist labor courses attended by hundreds of workers of the garage, the construction subunits, work shops, laboratories and printing presses and ending with the Marxism-Leninism University in which, ever since its establishment, more than 20,000 teachers and scientific associates have enhanced their ideological-political standards. Unfortunately, insufficient attention was paid to the topic of Marxist-Leninist education at the conference, although in this area as well some problems require major consideration. Obviously, a more detailed study could have been made in areas such as moral, labor and aesthetic upbringing and military-patriotic and mass sports work.

In exposing the major shortcomings in ideological work, the conference delegates earmarked practical measures to eliminate them. The MGU collective

must organize in a model fashion the education process within its own walls and supply progressive experience in this area to all VUZs in the country. The university's party organization must apply all its forces toward resolving this important problem.

Party control of administrative activities is an inseparable part of the organizational work of the MGU party committee. Four commissions provide permanent control in the areas of training, scientific work, student enrollment, capital construction and financial and economic activities.

The delegates noted that the party committee systematically controlled and directed the work of the public organizations at Moscow University as well as the people's control organs and handled problems of the socialist competition. The MGU party committee bureau regularly discusses the results of the labor competition within the university collective, competition criteria, implementation of socialist obligations and problems of improving the movement for model chairs.

The MGU party committee maintains constant and comprehensive ties with the Leninskiy Party Raykom. Its personnel participates in a number of party undertakings sponsored by the university. Some 400 teachers, associates and postgraduate students are actively involved in the ideological and mass political work of the CPSU raykom, head propaganda seminars and deliver lectures, reports and talks.

The city party committee and its secretaries and sectorial departments give the university comprehensive and specific assistance. V. V. Grishin, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Moscow city party committee first secretary, pays great attention to the organization of party work within the MGU collective. Delegates to the conference noted that his speech at the meeting with the university's leadership on 1 September 1982 was of essential significance in defining future developments and improving the work of the MGU party organization. V. V. Grishin discussed the most important trends in the work of the thousands-strong collective. He described means of upgrading the efficiency of scientific research and contractual projects, the solution of cadre problems, enhancing the quality of the training process and ideological-educational work, and improving the training of specialists in accordance with the new requirements of the economic sectors in Moscow and the rest of the country. The party committee informed all party members of the content of the document. It formulated and approved a procedure for acting on the critical remarks expressed during the meeting.

These remarks helped the collective to improve all aspects of activities of Moscow University. In discussing the forthcoming tasks, party committee secretary V. N. Gorokhov said:

"MGU is entering a new stage of development. The university's party committee and rectorate are faced with the great responsibility of defining properly future developments and formulating realistic and profoundly thought-out major ideas. It is a question of the main trends in scientific research, class and educational work, training highly skilled specialists and developing the material base. The party members must play a leading role in the implementation of these plans.

The MGU conference--one of the last to be held in Moscow--winds up the accountability and election campaign of the primary party organizations, more than 10,000 of which exist in the capital. The conference proved the high political activeness of the party members at the university and their ability to consider problems of party life on the basis of high principle-mindedness and self-criticism. The participants in the conference did not simply sum up results but scrupulously brought to light omissions in the work, analyzed problems, and defined the tasks and prospects for future activities.

A. M. Roganov, Moscow city party committee secretary, said that the party members at the university, who had accomplished a great deal to eliminate shortcomings, must do a great deal more in order to rise to the level of party requirements concerning the quality of all party work.

"Allow me to emphasize," he said, "that the present conference is taking place in a spirit of exigency. It proves that the university's party aktiv is well aware of the great responsibility facing the party organization, the rectorate and the faculty. The constructive approach to the study of the shortcomings in the work of the party organization leads us to assume that the university party members are not only aware of their omissions but are ready to take specific measures for their elimination."

The delegates expressed their profound and sincere gratitude to the CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet government for the attention, aid and concern which are constantly experienced by the party members and the entire collective of Moscow State University. On behalf of the party organization they assured them that they will apply all their strength, knowledge and experience for the solution of the major and responsible assignments set by the party.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/6

MODERN APPLIED MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER EXPERIMENT

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 83 (signed to press 13 Dec 83) pp 31-42

[Article by Academician A. Samarskiy]

[Text] The Soviet scientists are actively participating in resolving major problems of the development of science and technology, the national economy and society at large. No other way is possible today, when science has become a direct production force. This is the orientation set for us by the programmatic stipulations of the party and the documents of party congresses and CPSU Central Committee plenums. The scientists must make maximal use of available opportunities for the acceleration of scientific and technical progress.

I would like to discuss the tasks and prospects of applied mathematics and not merely from strictly professional positions. The reason is that this scientific sector is playing an increasingly noticeable role in a number of trends of the scientific and technical revolution.

The launching of the first Soviet artificial earth satellite, Yuriy Gagarin's thrust into outer space and his successful landing, would have been impossible without the all-round use of the methods of applied mathematics such as, for example, the preliminary and detailed simulation of the flight with the help of computers. This resulted in scientifically substantiated guarantees that this tremendous experiment, conducted for the first time in the history of mankind, would be successful. The computation of the trajectories of space apparatus and their reentry into the atmosphere, and the planning and changing of the work regimen of their engines, and space systems aboard the ships, self-tuning and self-learning with the help of computers, have firmly become part of cosmonautics. These examples, familiar but not isolated in the least, indicated the power of applied mathematics which is currently converting to direct modeling and, consequently, forecasting and optimizing a great variety of complex processes, phenomena and technical systems and their control. It is natural, therefore, that problems related to the development of applied mathematics are assuming national importance.

We are justifiably proud of our accomplishments and the results of the efforts of the Soviet people. However, we also realize with increasing clarity that even the tremendous resources of our country--energy, raw material and manpower--are by far not unlimited. Therefore, our current development must operate within rather rigid limits. The gravity of the situation is worsened

by the growing influence of industrial and agricultural production on the environment and the need for rapidly resolving most of the important problems.

For example, the solution of energy and ecological problems, and problems of economic planning and management and of improving technological processes, will greatly determine our future and cannot be postponed indefinitely. Considering the faster and "explosive" development of mankind, we are dealing not in terms of decades but of single years. Furthermore, the comprehensive approach based on the scientific forecast of all immediate and more distant consequences of current actions is of vital importance. For example, the natural balance is rather delicate and, as practical experience has indicated (which frequently puts us on guard as we can see from the fate of Kara-Bogaz and the results of draining the Polesye swamps), is to be handled with the greatest possible caution.

The need for the development of qualitatively new methods for decision-making and implementing became obvious. This inevitably influences our concepts regarding the objectives and means of knowledge, scientific mentality and the development of science as a whole.

Modern science as well must be efficient, qualitative and economical; the target and time factors become essential and so does the responsibility of the scientists for the results of their efforts. The formulation of a precise task and the time needed for research, orientation toward the most topical problems and their possible efficient restructuring, the unification of scientific efforts and enhancing the productivity of scientific labor, and the industrialization of science and its merger with production take priority.

Could applied mathematics accept this historical challenge and strengthen its positions within the overall progress? What new means does it have to this effect? These questions are hardly rhetorical, for the opinion still prevails of mathematics as a science for mathematicians only. We sometimes hear that a mathematician has the right to deal only with that for which he feels an "inner need," for mathematics has already acquired a number of results and has outstripped its time by centuries, and so on. Frequent reference is made to the need for the development of basic research. Unquestionably, without it science would rapidly slide on the tracks of "crawling empiricism." In any science, including mathematics, two lines are organically interwoven and enrich each other--the solution of basic problems and applied development. It is simply impossible to draw a clear dividing line between them. In that sense the term "applied mathematics" is conventional and does not mean any methodological simplification of this discipline (for applied mathematics makes use of the entire necessary arsenal of mathematical instruments), but indicates its direction toward resolving the vital problems of our time. In each specific historical situation a sensible compromise has existed between the two trends. Today we are forced to accept certain limitations and focus essentially on "oriented" basic research related to the main ways followed in the development of society. Any other approach under contemporary conditions could cause irreparable harm.

It is my profound conviction that mathematicians not only can but must assume a greater share of responsibility in resolving the urgent and difficult problems of our development.

This conviction is based on my own almost 40 years' experience in the field of applied mathematics. Naturally, this scientific area is not of recent vintage, for mathematics was born above all as an applied discipline needed for purposes of acquiring knowledge in astronomy (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 20, p 500). It has long developed traditions and results.

Over the past 35-40 years, however, essential changes have taken place in applied mathematics, which have radically changed its aspect and prepared it for the solution of major contemporary scientific and technical problems. These changes became possible thanks to a seemingly accidental yet actually legitimate combination of two factors: the development of computers and the formulation of qualitatively new problems of unparalleled complexity, which faced science in general and mathematics in particular. This refers to mastery of nuclear and thermonuclear energy and the development of flight apparatus which could conquer outer space.

It was not easy to look at the first computers--cumbersome and unreliable--as the harbingers for a new scientific methodology. Academician A. V. Keldysh, the outstanding Soviet mathematician and scientific organizer, was among the first to assess properly their role and to devote a great deal of effort to ensure their development and utilization. For the first time in the entire history of science specialists who had previously had nothing but pen and paper were given an advanced instrument consistent with the requirements of scientific and technical progress. It is no accident that contemporary applied mathematics, which is frequently (and justly) identified with computer mathematics, provided the theoretical foundation for the creation of our country's nuclear missile shield and atomic power industry (see "The Main Theoretician of Cosmonautics" in the collection "Schast'ye Tvorcheskikh Pobed" [The Joy of Creative Victories]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, p 116).

This marked the beginning of a new stage in the development of applied mathematics. Its "realm of influence" expanded immeasurably, from computing and engineering machines and structures to studying the mechanism of cardiac activities and from the study of processes occurring in the microworld to study of matters related to the origin and development of the universe. Soviet science holds firm positions in that area. We have created large scientific schools, which have been successfully at work for a number of years, as well as collectives of highly skilled computer-using mathematicians.

The appearance of computers helped tremendously to expand man's intellectual possibilities and to emancipate his mental power. Contemporary computers carry out millions and dozens of millions of computer operations per second. Furthermore, computers can store and rapidly process as desired huge amounts of data (up to 1 million regular units), which inevitably appear in the course of computations. Finally, computers are supplied with means for "communicating" with man, relieving him of a number of routine operations and enabling him efficiently to control machines in the course of his research. All of this makes them, along with radio telescopes, lasers, accelerator particles and other outstanding instruments and systems, irreplaceable assistants of man in the study and advancement of the world around us.

One must remember, however, that computers are nothing but instruments and that in themselves they are no panacea. It is exceptionally important to keep a proper perspective on their use. The possibilities of computers become apparent only when combined with all other existing research methods and acquired experience. Long and difficult research led applied mathematics to the development of a new scientific method which may have seemed paradoxically named: computer experiment (or, as it is also known, mathematical experiment or mathematical modeling).

What does this mean? Briefly, it means the creation and study of mathematical models of studied objects with the help of computers.

Is the word "experiment" applicable here? Unquestionably, it is. In mathematical modeling we are dealing not with the phenomenon itself but with some kind of theoretical "copy," a model which expresses mathematically the basic laws which it obeys. Numerous successful examples in various fields of the natural sciences and technology have indicated that this "model" may be made quite artistically and perfectly. As a result, in conducting a computing experiment, the researcher tests nature itself (a structure, technological process, a natural object), asking it questions and obtaining strict and relatively complete answers.

The possibility of replacing the initial object with its mathematical "copy" and of conducting further "dialogue" with it offers great advantages and means a serious change in the methodology and technology of scientific research. Actually, a new workstyle develops for individual scientists and entire collectives, consistent with the spirit of the times. It can be said that this computer experiment has been developed in applied mathematics during the entire postwar period. At this point it is ready for use by physicists, biologists, chemists, physicians, engineers and designers. The inevitability of the extensive use of mathematical modeling in the implementation of comprehensive governmental scientific and technical programs is becoming increasingly clear.

The Computer Experiment--New Methodology and Technology of Scientific Research

By now the concept of the computer experiment has been developed in detail and its good sides and the difficulties hindering its development have become quite apparent. Actually, the various stages which must be covered by a computing experiment are the specific manifestations of the objective process of knowledge, starting with abstraction and ending with the practical utilization of the acquired knowledge.

A mathematical model or a "mathematical image" of the studied object is formulated during the first stage. The prototype is then cleared of "accidental features" and the most essential of the ties which characterize it are singled out. As a rule, these ties are recorded as equations which express the fundamental laws of the natural sciences (such as the law of the preservation of energy), as applicable to the given object. The objects themselves may be entirely different in terms of nature and purpose. They may be physical or biological phenomena, technological processes, mechanisms or designs.

The idealizing, the simplification of the initial phenomenon, is the beginning of all scientific research. What are the new features of the computer experiment? Its most important advantage is that it enables us to make an efficient study of the complex and complete mathematical models which provide a comprehensive description of the project. Standard mathematical methods enable us to study only relatively simple models, i.e., individual aspects of the processes and in most of the practically important cases turn out to be adequate only at the initial research stage.

Classical mathematics dealt essentially with linear problems and was able to achieve outstanding successes through this method. On the mathematical level this means that the sum (superposition) of any individual solutions of a given problem are also its solution. In a broader sense linearity means a similarity between the parts and the entity, the possibility of predicting the behavior of the object according to the behavior of its individual fragments. This property (the principle of superposition) is extensively used in traditional methodology for the development of general theories.

Practical experience indicates, however, that we have entered the period of the study of nonlinear phenomena. For example, the problems of thermal physics become nonlinear whenever the condition of the object changes substantially (its temperature, for example). As a whole, nonlinear objects are not the simple sum of their components. Furthermore, they can become substantially more complex as they develop. As a result the mathematical problems increase immeasurably, for classical approaches cannot be used in the creation of an adequate general theory.

This, however, is not the main difficulty. An uneven (sometimes opposite to the expected one) change in behavior, rather than a smooth development, proves to be an inner feature of nonlinear systems. External conditions may change continuously and "sensibly," one might think. As a rule, therefore, the behavior of nonlinear objects cannot be predicted exclusively on the basis of previous experience. Atmospheric processes, which have a determining influence on shaping the weather, are a typical and virtually daily example of such phenomena.

This requires the development of methods for the study of nonlinear problems. One of them is the computer experiment. Naturally, it is applied in the study of linear objects as well, which may have a complex spatial structure, which depend on a large number of parameters, and so on. However, it is precisely nonlinear problems which remain its most natural field of action.

The creation of a mathematical model is merely the first step. We must study its behavior, i.e., resolve its equations with different values of the parameters which control the process. To this effect we use the basic theoretical apparatus of computer mathematics--numerical methods (computer algorithms). This enables us to obtain an approximate solution of the very complex problems of the final number of mathematical operations. Although the initial numerical methods used in resolving some problems were suggested by Newton and Euler themselves, their effectiveness was fully realized only following the appearance of the computer experiment. The theory of contemporary numerical

methods is a widespread branch of mathematics with major accomplishments to its credit. Its improvement eliminates restrictions caused by the complexity of the studied mathematical models.

The choice of the computer algorithm is the second stage in the mathematical experiment. The stage which follows is that of a computer program which realizes the selected algorithm, i.e., it "translates" it into a language understood by the computer.

What is noteworthy is that mathematics has developed not only its tool but its own "technology." One of its important elements is the problem-oriented applied program packages. The complexity of contemporary programs and the demands they face are increasing steadily. At the same time, a large number of algorithms for the solution of a broad range of problems has been acquired. We face problems related to the effective exchange of acquired experience, standardization of the program stock and its accessibility, and the prevention of unnecessary duplication of projects.

Applied program packages offer the opportunity of having relatively simple prescribed programs (modules) and the automatic compilation of complex programs on their basis, in the same manner that standardized parts are used in erecting a variety of architectural systems. They are equipped with advanced means of "communication" with man, opening operative access to them to a wide range of consumers who cannot waste the time and effort for a detailed study of their structure. With the development of the program package the activities of mathematicians assume the features of industrial production. The end product of such efforts is the concentrated results and experience of one of the most highly efficient forms of human labor.

The most emotionally charged and dramatic stage of the computer experiment is the use of computers in designing programs. This largely resembles an ordinary experiment. A series of computations (measurements) are made on the machine (the experimental system), as a result of which the researcher obtains a number of figures which describe the behavior of the object.

The final stage includes the analysis of results and their comparison with purely theoretical forecasts and physical experimentation data. This determines the extent to which the mathematical model and the computer algorithm have been aptly chosen. If necessary, they are refined and the "cycle" of the computing experiment is repeated on a more advanced level.

Usually the mathematicians considered their task accomplished once they had been able to prove that a possible solution to the problem exists in principle. The result of the computer experiment is the expression within a precise quantitative form of the detailed and specific practical recommendations for reaching the set target (such as improving a specific parameter).

A number of important problems arise in connection with the computer experimentation. Above all, we must define the area of its application. The computer experiment is used for the study, prognostication and optimizing complex multiple parameter nonlinear processes, the theoretical and experimental study of which is either difficult or impossible with traditional

methods. For example, the work of a blast furnace depends on such a large number of interrelated factors that no simple theoretical means can be used to describe it in full. Nature modeling on a reduced scale merely provides partial information on its work. There is no total spatial-temporal correlation between the gigantic industrial system and the small experimental facility (the lack of a physical simulator is a typical situation in most contemporary scientific and technical problems). Conducting a series of full-scale experiments is problematic, bearing in mind the expense and length.

In frequent cases the physical experiment is dangerous and can be conducted only once (changes in the condition of ecological systems, climate control), and demands a great deal of time (selection activities) or is simply impossible (threat to human health and geo- and astrophysical processes; for example, we cannot reproduce the work of the sun, although a mathematical modeling of the 11-year cycles of its activities would give us a key to understanding this important phenomenon).

In all such situations a computer experiment becomes vitally necessary, for it greatly reduces the time and cost of research and the number of scientists, engineers and workers involved in such work, and enhances the substantiation of consequent decisions.

In speaking of the "economical nature" of a computer experiment, we must point out the outstanding property of mathematical models: their universality. In his time V. I. Lenin emphasized this circumstance in his brilliant work "Materialism and Empiriocriticism:" "The unity of nature is detected in a 'striking analogy' through differential equations related to different phenomena" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 18, p 306). For example, mathematical models of processes of heat transmission, mixing substances, motion of groundwater, and the filtration of gases in ground rocks are virtually identical (the sole difference lies in their value).

Consequently, computer facilities (computers, algorithms, program complexes), created for the solution of a specific problem are of a multiple-target nature and could be easily reoriented toward the solution of entirely different ones. The scientific collectives who have mastered such problems are, therefore, a very dynamic segment of our strategic potential.

Researchers engaged in mathematical modeling (or of any other type of modeling) frequently face the question of the extent to which they could trust its results. For they are studying not the object itself but its mathematical model.... How is this age-old philosophical-methodological problem resolved in this case?

Let us note above all that making a model for a computer experiment is not a speculative act, started "from scratch." It is based on all existing experimental information and theoretical concepts and all previously gained experience. Furthermore, its implementation stages stipulate an "internal control" which guarantees the noncontradictoriness of selected models, an adequate

"resolution ability" of the algorithm, the work accuracy of the program, and so on. Finally, a comparison between the results and the practice and the refinement of the model is a mandatory prerequisite.

As a result of this process, the model is "calibrated." The area of its applicability is determined and a set of "standardized" models is created and subsequently studied independently.

The regular "technological cycle" of a computer experiment is a spiral in the process of determining a scientific truth. Its results are a system of relative truths each one of which dialectically rejects the previous one and eliminates arising contradictions. In the course of its self-development and comparison with practical results, the computer experiment "becomes wized" and its results become increasingly accurate.

Conventionally speaking, the computer experiment has two basic phases. The first phase is the creation of a system of models for the system of objectives. It is related to the organization and testing of mathematical models and computer algorithms and it serves to prove their adequacy and their consistency with the phenomena under study. The second phase is the all-round modeling of the real object and controlling its behavior (the forecast and control phase).

It would be erroneous to pit the computer against the natural experiments, as is sometimes done. In this case we ignore the fact that the time of experimental studies based on direct sensory perceptions is past. In modern experiments we are dealing not with the object itself but its manifestations, which are quite indirect and confused. Consequently, the experimenter must use a certain model of the object under study (as a rule greatly simplified).

Let us also note that the results of measurements in present-day experiments require a complex and thorough decoding. This actually requires a special computing experiment related to the processing and study of the results of the measurements which model the interaction between the object and the measuring instrument (the data of which are used in the "basic" computer experiment which studies the initial object). At the same time, to reduce the function of the computer experiment merely to the interpretation of experimental data means to diminish its "futurological" possibilities.

For the first time in our country a scientific discovery based on a computer (!) experiment (the T-layer effect) was officially registered in 1968. It turned out that as plasma moves in a magnetic field thin but highly temperature-resistant strata could develop within it, distinguished from the remaining plasma by their characteristics. Why was this effect not discovered previously? Its manifestation required the creation of specific conditions which had not been established thus far. According to the computer experiment, physical experimentation was conducted in several laboratories throughout the country under the stipulated conditions (but only 5 years later). They were well-consistent with the mathematical forecasts.

Currently the T-layer effect is used in explaining solar chromospheric explosions. On the practical level, the construction of industrial magnetic-hydrodynamic generators for electric power, making substantial use of this

effect is being planned (some difficulties of plasma control are being eliminated and requirements concerning the heat resistance of the generators are being reduced). In turn, these generators will be applied in the program for the utilization of the coal mined at the Kansk-Achinsk deposits.

Therefore, the proper interaction between a computer and a physical experiment substantially upgrades the effectiveness of scientific developments. This is equally applicable to the traditional theoretical research methods. They are not "eliminated" in the least; conversely, their importance increases in obtaining preliminary data and testing the algorithms.

The computer experiment necessarily also encourages the development of basic research. For example, the modeling of physical processes requires highly accurate knowledge of macroscopic characteristics of substances (malleability, heat conductivity, and so on). Unquestionably, obtaining them is a basic physical problem reduced to resolving a large number of complex quantum mechanics problems. Such studies, however, are not conducted arbitrarily (for all values of temperature, pressure or type of substance), but are "oriented," related to the initial project.

The organization itself of the computer experiment is inconceivable without the collective efforts of scientists in different areas, engineers and designers, and without the development of interdisciplinary studies. Their knowledge and experience, which are concentrated toward the common objective, is enriched and gains new features. For example, the need created under the "pressure" of a computer experiment led to making substantial advances in the development of mathematical areas such as the theory of differential and integral-differential equations, linear algebra and the theory of automatic machines. Therefore, the computer experiment is a convenient method for cooperating with mental labor and enhancing its productivity. Joint efforts and the synthesis of results are, in this case, no pious wish but a natural necessity.

As Comrade Yu. V. Andropov emphasizes, the question of rapidly applying achievements of science in production has not lost any of its urgency. The computer experiment offers new opportunities for its solution. Ten to 15 years ago it would have been difficult to speak of its extensive use in resolving technological problems, for example, whereas today this is becoming reality.

The contemporary technological processes are quite complex and cannot be studied as a "pure" experiment. Furthermore, the necessary experimental facilities or the possibility of assigning qualified scientific cadres are not always extant. Therefore, the implementation of "scientific idea-laboratory research-experimental production-industry" chain demands a great deal of time and effort.

The advantages of mathematical modeling enable us to bypass a number of intermediary stages in scientific research and development and turn directly to industrial production, which should result in a faster growth of labor productivity.

Today a computer experiment is used in improving expensive and delicate technological processes such as the growing of semiconductor crystals and films, laser and laser-plasma processing of materials, optimizing the temperature regimen of structural assemblies of new computers (this is a noteworthy case of "self-servicing"--a computer experiment which helps to create its own future material base). Extensive use is being made of specially developed applied program packages which are gradually delivered to the consumer.

Mathematicians who have mastered the methods of the computer experiment have come very close to the field of production tasks. Their participation in the formulation of specific technical solutions, rationalization suggestions and inventions is no longer a subject of amazement. This is confirmed, for example, by the mathematical modeling which was done of the heating of metal parts of automobiles in the course of their chemical-heat processing. The task was to select a temperature regimen for the surface of the parts in which they could be heated evenly and within a minimum time. The dependence between the surface temperature and the time proved to be so complex that one could not imagine how this problem could be resolved through conventional theoretical work or through a series of physical experiments.

Obviously, technological problems are a rich field of activity. Even an insignificant improvement in the technology of manufacturing a single part or instrument on the scale of an enterprise, not to mention a sector, yields tangible results.

One of the tempting possibilities in resolving the energy problem is achieving controlled thermonuclear reaction (synthesis of hydrogen isotopes in the course of which a huge quantity of energy is released). It offers the advantages of a practically unlimited reserve of "fuel" and ecological cleanliness.

The task of creating a controllable "artificial sun," i.e., a reactor in which the plasma is heated to tremendous temperatures and generates energy, formulated for the first time in our country, is a basic physical and tremendous engineering-technical problem. Several means of achieved thermonuclear synthesis exist (most of them suggested by Soviet scientists). In turn, any project includes a number of variants and each variant is a rather complex and expensive engineering-physical problem. The computer experiment enables us to make an optimal choice of strategy. It acts as a kind of impartial "umpire," which compares the strong and weak points of the various projects on the basis of a uniform methodology. It is thus that with its help, here again time, efforts and funds are saved.

Let us note that in resolving such problems mathematicians-computer experts and physicists act jointly as equal co-authors of new concepts (see N. G. Basov, "Laser Thermonuclear Synthesis," PRIRODA, No 1, 1983, pp 4-11). Today both at home and abroad no single project for thermonuclear synthesis can be considered without a "visa" based on computer experimentation.

We could say with full justification that the computer experiment, which combines the advantages of the theoretical and experimental research methods, is the answer of applied mathematics to the vital problems of today.

Difficulties, Tasks, Prospects

The objective and subjective difficulties which hinder the application of the computer experiment should not be ignored. This problem has several aspects.

For a number of reasons, for many years the possibilities and achievements of the computer experiment were unfamiliar to the broad circles of the scientific and technical public. Consequently, the dissemination of its ideas and methods has had to be intensified. The increased number of monographs and popular science publications on this topic, the course for young scientists which was offered, and the full participation of computer specialists in the work of basic scientific and technical publications, the organization of the interdisciplinary journal *MATEMATICHESKOYE MODELIROVANIYE* and the help of the All-Union Knowledge Society and of the press and television are measures which must be taken to correct the situation, for the "demoniacal force" of ignorance erects a certain psychological barrier between computer experimentation and possible consumers.

It is frequently assumed that a mathematical experiment is the province of mathematicians exclusively. "Let us give them a problem, let them compute and let us then consider..." This is an error founded on ignorance. The computer experiment is a kind of collective scientific decathlon and success is possible only if its "technological cycle" is closed, i.e., if all stages, starting with the formulation of the task and ending with the study of results, take place on a high level.

For example, the making of mathematical models cannot be entrusted entirely to the mathematicians. This approach may lead to the "emasculatation" of the models, and their separation from the research target. The lack of good mathematical models is a hindrance which prevents us from discovering a number of reserves for upgrading the productivity of scientific work on the basis of computer experimentation. More intensive work on the development of such models would enable us as of now, within the framework of the existing facilities, to give real help to progress in many fields of science and technology. Physicists, chemists, biologists, engineers, designers and technologists, on the one hand, and mathematicians, on the other, must advance more boldly toward each other.

One of the organizational forms of such cooperation is the creation of mathematical modeling sections under the councils of the USSR Academy of Sciences in charge of the respective comprehensive problems and assigning head institutes which will coordinate the computer experiment. Practical experience in working on problems of plasma physics has indicated the sensible nature of such an organization which has now led to the development of "computer physics." Naturally, this is not any special kind of physics but a discipline which studies physical phenomena on the basis of computer experimentation. The use of the experience accumulated in this area in other areas of the natural sciences and technology is on the agenda.

If we formulate the problem on a broader basis, the computer experiment should be considered a mandatory stage in the planning and development of

major projects. Such is precisely the case today with cosmonautics. This is a good guideline for the other scientific and economic sectors. The quality of mathematical modeling and its consistency with contemporary standards could be controlled, for example, by commissions of experts and highly skilled specialists with practical experience in resolving complex problems.

Another typical error is to reduce computer experimentation merely to computations, to consider it technical routine work. Such an attitude (unfortunately, encountered among many executives as well) is the result of traditional education in which there is virtually no place, for example, for contemporary numerical methods. It is natural, therefore, that the situation in terms of their development and application cannot be considered satisfactory.

To begin with, some mathematicians tend to consider numerical methods as a purely mathematical project which does not tie them to the solution of specific problems. Let us frankly admit that work involving the solution of a major practical problem (even with the help of previously developed methods or packets of programs) is a valuable contribution to science. Changing the mentality of leading specialists in various fields of science and involving a rather large corps of Soviet mathematicians in the development of mathematical modeling and the use of digital methods is a topical current task.

Secondly, the influx of new skilled cadres in computer mathematics is sharply limited, for the existing VUZ programs and curricula do not reflect the current achievements in this area. It is necessary, therefore, to review the programs and create school aids for mathematics, mechanics, physics, chemistry, and biology oriented toward the study of mathematical models and digital methods and the practical utilization of computer experimentation as well as a drastic increase in the enrollment of students in these areas. Their training must be focused on problems related to the proper formulation of arising problems, methods for study with the help of mathematical models and application of results.

On a wider plane, it is precisely the leading VUZs which employ a large number of scientists in various fields and have sufficiently large computer centers, which could become basic organizers and promoters of the computer experiment, along with others. A substantial reserve here is using the efforts and enthusiasm of seniors and postgraduate students if their work is not purely academic but closely related to the activities of leading scientific collectives. Long practical experience has indicated that in the course of collective activities not only are efforts summed up but research rises to a higher quality level. Furthermore, working within a collective is an important social factor in the development of young scientists. It is clear today that in order to train highly skilled computer specialists we must involve scientists from academic and sectorial institutes into teaching and consultations in VUZs. We must enhance the reputation of this profession. Without a proper reorganization of higher education the development of mathematical modeling could face tremendous difficulties.

Another way toward the solution of personnel problems is to organize the extensive practical training of scientific associates in institutes which are

developing and applying mathematical modeling. Also noteworthy is the system for cadre retraining operated by the large VUZs and sectorial skill enhancement institutes. Positive experience exists in both areas but insufficient use is being made of existing facilities.

The cadre problem has another side as well. Occasionally we hear complaints about the insufficient amount of computer equipment and about its quality. However, a study of the work of several organizations has indicated that frequently by no means all the possibilities of computers are being used. At best they are used as "huge adding machines" and at worst all that are used are peripheral computer systems (word processors, for example).

What is the reason for this situation? It is considered "proper" for virtually any institution, enterprise or organization to have its own computer center and personnel (in principle, this aspiration is progressive). However, an understanding seems to exist to the effect that the presence of a computer by itself resolves all problems. Problems related to the selection and formulation of assignments and the training of specialists who can use digital methods to resolve such problems are considered secondary. Such an approach leads to exactly the opposite results. It discredits computer mathematics and profanes its accomplishments.

The gap between the complexity of the problems to be resolved and capacity of the computers is an objective long-term situation. It is caused by the fact that practical experience is formulating increasingly more difficult problems the solution of which pushes the possibilities of computer equipment to its limits. The only way to surmount is to concentrate computer capacities within the large scientific centers which have experience in work on difficult practical problems and the training of cadres which can master and improve computer algorithms (a number of examples may be cited of the successful solution of rather complex problems with relatively low-powered computers compared to the foreign-made, thanks to the use of more advanced numerical methods).

Let us note that the development of microelectronics promises to reduce the cost of computers and their operation by several hundred percent within a short time. The main outlays for computer experimentation will be related to the training of cadres which, as we know, requires a substantial amount of time. Consequently, this problem is becoming even more urgent and must be resolved already today at a pace outstripping the development of computer technology.

The USSR Academy of Sciences and State Committee for Science and Technology are coordinating the creation and application of problem-oriented packages of applied programs for the solution of a variety of scientific and technical problems. Such activities are being conducted both on the national scale and within CEMA. One of its positive results is the creation of a large number of program packages and the noticeable increase in their share in the development of computer mathematical support systems.

Nevertheless, a number of unresolved problems remain. For example, problems of receiving and transmitting packages to protecting ownership rights and material incentives for their developers have not been entirely resolved. We are

somewhat behind the leading Western countries in the solution of these problems. The packages "industry" in a number of them has become quite highly developed. Program packages are becoming an ordinary commodity on the market for new technologies. Another negative factor is the tendency to create packages as such. We must not forget that their development becomes sensible on a rather high stage in the computer experimentation, when the nature of the problems to be resolved has been clearly defined and corresponding algorithms developed. In the opposite case the packages become ineffective. Packages with applied programs are one of the foundations of computer mathematics technology and problems related to their development should be supervised by experienced experts and always be within sight of all interested specialists and organizations.

Our applied mathematics faces rather difficult scientific-organizational problems. However, efficient means of resolving them are equally clear. Applied mathematics can maintain its proper place and strengthen its positions in the scientific and technical revolution.

Facing the urgent tasks of our time and having at its disposal an army of skilled workers who are extensively and skillfully using the computer experiment and plunging into increasingly new areas in the study of processes within animate and inanimate nature and industrial production is what I and my colleagues imagine to be the immediate future of applied mathematics.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/6

HIGH RESPONSIBILITY OF CRITICISM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 83 (signed to press 13 Dec 83) pp 42-51

[Editorial article]

[Text] It would be difficult to overestimate the historical programmatic significance of the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. We turn to its documents with tremendous interest, again and again. In pursuing the line of the 26th Congress, the plenum comprehensively discussed the main tasks of the party in the field of ideological work under contemporary conditions and earmarked scientific ways for our further economic and social development. Extremely close attention was paid at the plenums to problems of artistic culture, which was welcomed with satisfaction and understanding by the creative intelligentsia. "The party," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, said in his outstanding speech, "supports everything which enriches science and culture and contributes to the education of the working people in the spirit of the norms and principles of developed socialism."

As was pointed out at the plenum, the scale at which cultural values are being disseminated in our country is truly huge. Our country has the highest number of readers in the world. Theater, museum and art exhibit attendance is rising steadily. The motion picture enjoys great popularity. Thanks to the mass information media--the press, radio and television and, within the foreseeable future, the videocassette industry--art is entering the individual home and family literally every day and every hour. Millions of people have become involved in amateur artistic performances. Many dance groups, ensembles and choirs at plants are as good as professional groups in terms of performing skill and wealth of repertory. The network of people's theaters is developing successfully. Photography and motion picture-making are becoming increasingly popular.

In a word, in its various forms and aspects art has become an inseparable part of the spiritual life of modern man. Starting with early childhood, sometimes imperceptibly, art assumes even a more powerful influence on the shaping of his moral convictions, conceptual principles and aesthetic tastes and requirements. "All of us can see," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov points out, "that as the cultural standard of the people rises so does the influence of art on the minds of the people. This also increases the opportunities for its active intervention in social life. This means that the responsibility of the workers in the arts for ensuring that this powerful weapon in their

hands serves the cause of the people and communism increases to a tremendous extent."

The June CPSU Central Committee Plenum properly rated the creative accomplishments of the masters of Soviet art. Many of their works have earned nationwide recognition and great success abroad. They have enriched contemporary spiritual culture. However, delegates at the plenum also mentioned negative phenomena and works which contribute nothing to the minds and hearts of the people. Naturally, the artistic process cannot trigger exclusively masterpieces. It inevitably includes works of different aesthetic caliber. This, however, is no reason for complacency or lack of exigency. The June Plenum justifiably indicated the need for a qualitative enhancement of the ideological and aesthetic standards of our art and the intensification of its party and civic-mindedness. This is a demand of the time, of the age of developed socialism. Even the art showing the most talent, Comrade Yu. V. Andropov said, will not reach its goal unless it is filled with the profound ideas closely related to the realities of today's life and indicates the path to further progress.

The party has a "concerned and respectful attitude toward talent and toward the creative searches of the artist. It does not interfere in the forms and style of his work. However, the party cannot remain indifferent to the ideological content of art. It will always direct the development of art in such a way that it serves the interests of the people. Naturally, it is not a question of bureaucratic administration. Marxist-Leninist criticism, active, responsive and intolerant of ideologically alien and professionally poor works, must remain the principal method of influencing artistic creativity."

These views found in Comrade Yu. V. Andropov's speech creatively develop and concretize the most important principles governing the party guidance of the arts. Under the conditions of mature socialism, with its inherent intensive development of spiritual culture, literary-artistic criticism is given a task of tremendous ideological and professional importance. More than ever before it must energetically and purposefully influence ideological and aesthetic development; it must persistently and convincingly pursue the party's line. It must struggle for a high level of art in following a proper ideological and political line.

Let us recall that Marx, Engels and Lenin, who made a radical turn in the social sciences, also laid the foundations for a new truly scientific aesthetics which necessarily presumes an effective intervention in the artistic process and a direct contact with it. They themselves set most noteworthy examples of such an approach. The young Marx analyzed in detail, with passion and sharpness, the rather popular novel at that time, "The Secrets of Paris" by the French writer Eugene Sue. To this day it triggers our admiration for the seriousness and elegance of critical analysis. It not only totally destroyed this cheap work but also profoundly exposed its social roots and bourgeois-philistine nature. Another splendid critical essay was Engels' famous letter to Lassalle on the subject of the latter's play, "Frantz von Sickingen!" How attentive and tactful Engels was in the choice of his words and adjectives and how principle-minded and accurate all of his

remarks and assessments were. He applied to Lassalle's works "the strictest possible requirements," in the belief that no other approach to the work of an artist is possible: "Criticism in the interest of the party itself" must "be most frank" (see K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 29, p 495). That is also the way Marx understood criticism, to which he ascribed great importance.

Despite its entire philosophical and ideological purposefulness and clarity, such criticism also took into consideration the essential characteristics and psychological specifics of the work of art. Marx's and Engels' views about Goethe, Schiller, Balzac, Heine, Thackeray and Freiligrat and the Russian and Norwegian writers most profoundly penetrated into the internal world of art and its character structure. This was also highly typical of Lenin who, under the new historical circumstances, developed an integral concept of party literature. At the same time, his theory of the two cultures--the democratic and progressive and the antinational and reactionary--within each national culture became the methodological base for a truly scientific analysis of art in terms of its historical origins and contemporary forms and aspects.

Lenin himself provided brilliant examples of such analysis in his articles on Tolstoy and his letters and statements concerning Gor'kiy and other writers and poets. We tirelessly turn to these documents in which Lenin's thoughts, sharp mind and warm heart are alive. Who defined the historical position of Leo Tolstoy in world culture more profoundly, outstandingly and precisely? His creativity is a "step forward in the artistic development of all mankind" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Completed Collected Works], vol 20, p 19). Indeed, nothing could be either deleted or added to this statement. While being proud of and admiring the great writer of the Russian land, Lenin did not ignore his errors and mistakes to which he provided an accurate and substantiated class assessment. Lenin's principle-mindedness and exigency are as scientific and theoretical as they are moral and personality factors. Here one is as inseparable from the other as it is in the best works by party literary workers and Vladimir Il'ich's students and fellow workers--V. Borovskiy, A. Lunacharskiy, M. Ol'minskiy and I. Skvortsov-Stepanov.

In remembering our great predecessors, we must not fail to name the outstanding philosophers of the 19th century, Belinskiy, Hertzen, Dobrolyubov and Chernyshevsky above all. As the rulers of the minds of several generations of democratic intelligentsia, they raised to an essentially new level the very profession of critic as the navigator of the literary ship, daringly and confidently guiding it in the tempestuous aesthetic waters. These waters were not merely aesthetic. The revolutionary-democratic critics always emphasized the need for the closest possible ties between the artist and social life and the progressive and freedom-loving trends of social thinking; they asked him to defend the principles of social realism and nationality zealously and convincingly.

This criticism was the sensitive consciousness of art and its voice was listened to and considered even by those who were far from it in terms of

their ideological positions and artistic orientations. It would be no exaggeration to say that the literary legacy of the great Russian critics is as permanent in terms of universal significance as the works of the classics of critical realism.

Relying on tremendous historical experience and taking into consideration the characteristics of the current stage in the development of artistic culture, the party is systematically pursuing a course of enhancing the public reputation of literary and artistic criticism. This was a subject of great attention at the 25th and 26th CPSU congresses. The special CPSU Central Committee decree "On Literary-Artistic Criticism" was passed in January 1972. It emphasized the high civic mission of criticism and its party responsibility for the state of affairs in the area of artistic culture. The CPSU Central Committee decrees "On Work With the Creative Youth" (October 1976), "On Further Improving Ideological and Political Education Work" (April 1979), "On the Creative Ties Between Literary-Artistic Journals and the Practice of Communist Construction" (July 1982) and "On the Work of the Party Organization at the Belorussian State Academic Theater imeni Yanko Kupala" (February 1983) stipulate the need to intensify the ideological and creative activeness of criticism and radically to strengthen its ties with life and socioproduction practice.

Finally, the question of criticism was considered at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum along with a number of basic problems of party ideological work under contemporary conditions. Since according to the stipulation of the plenum the principal method in influencing artistic creativity should be Marxist-Leninist criticism, the latter must act as the political representative of the party in the artistic culture of the developed socialist society. This is a lofty mission and a high trust which inspires but also makes it incumbent to work with maximal creative returns.

The ideological and theoretical potential of our criticism has noticeably improved in recent years. It has begun to promote more energetically the party's line in the field of artistic culture. Its ties with the people's life and the practice of socialist construction have strengthened. This has made it possible to consider aesthetic problems in the context of topical political, ideological, philosophical, sociological and ethical problems of our time. Assessments of stylistic trends and individual works of art have become more principle-minded and definite; the attitude toward the specific features of talent and creative searching has become more careful and attentive. The comprehensive experience of national cultures and their close interaction and rapprochement within the framework of the single socialist culture, international in terms of its internal structure and enthusiasm, have become an organic part of our critical thinking. The internal laws of socialist realism, its sources, present condition and historical prospects and global significance are being analyzed more profoundly and concretely.

More intensive studies are being made of the cultures of the fraternal socialist countries and the democratic and progressive trends in foreign art. The struggle against bourgeois-revisionist concepts in art studies and aesthetics is being waged more consistently and on the basis of more clearly

determined conceptual positions. The articles written by our leading critics against anti-Sovietism, anticommunism, militarism, racism, and decadence, whatever "artistic" forms they may have adopted, triggered significant public response. The attitude toward bourgeois "mass culture" and elitist snob culture has become more intolerant, and their internal ideological similarity has been exposed in a number of major studies.

Our press conducted major debates on the further development of Soviet multinational art, the method of socialist realism as an aesthetic system and contemporary characters, motion picture and the youth, and the writing of plays. Topical tasks of criticism were discussed at the congresses and plenums of creative associations and meetings of the artistic intelligentsia. Such tasks are being interpreted in an increasingly organic and profound fashion in terms of their direct ideological significance and in close connection with the political, economic and social problems being resolved by the party and the people in the course of building communism. The best works of Soviet critics are distinguished by the depth of their thoughts, clarity and presentation, as well as passionate involvement with the destinies of art. A number of them have been awarded the Lenin and State prizes of the USSR, the state prizes of union republics and the prizes of public organizations. We are pleased to note that many talented young people have become critics and have already been able to prove themselves in a vivid and serious manner. The family of literary-critical journals has expanded. Problems of literature and new artistic phenomena are steadily covered by LITERATURNAYA GAZETA and the republic's literary newspapers. The activities of the critical reviews of sections of literary-artistic and art study journals, some 100 of which are currently being published, have been energized.

Therefore, a great deal has been accomplished. However, we cannot beat the kettle drums and rest on our laurels. Generally speaking, this is not typical of party members, as was particularly emphasized at the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum. "Our entire ideological, educational and propaganda work," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov said, "must be decisively raised to the level of the major and complex problems being resolved by the party in the course of advancing developed socialism."

This statement by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary fully applies to literary-artistic criticism. We must acknowledge that its current condition is still below the requirements of our time. The works of the critics contain a number of shortcomings and errors to which the closest possible attention should be drawn.

The CPSU Central Committee decree "On Literary-Artistic Criticism" itself indicated the clear gaps in the press coverage of the artistic process. Many new books, films, plays, art exhibits or concerts are not thoroughly analyzed either in the general or the specialized press. Frequently they are even totally ignored by the critics. Such a situation justifiably triggers the indignation of some creative workers while others find it to their advantage. In either case, this is to the detriment of the cause. Sometimes interesting artistic initiatives are not given proper encouragement, while aesthetic triteness and professional helplessness are not being promptly rebuffed. We

are particularly concerned with the silence surrounding foreign works. Comrade K. U. Chernenko, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary, mentioned in his speech at the June Plenum that in the course of cultural exchanges, "along with meaningful works we receive motion pictures, plays, publications and music characterized by lack of ideas, triteness and artistic groundlessness." Such negative phenomena are not always given a principle-minded assessment. We sometimes avoid an exigent study of complex and controversial films and books, leaving the audience and the readers without proper ideological and aesthetic orientation.

The view is frequently expressed that considering the present overabundance of artistic information, it is simply impossible physically to review it all. The difficulties are substantial, indeed. However, one could legitimately ask the following: to what extent are we making skillful, efficient and purposeful use of favorable opportunities? To what extent are we objective in the choice of works to be analyzed? Let us frankly say that sometimes it is not easy to determine the criteria which guide one reviewer or editorial board or another in making such selections. Understandably, everyone hastens to respond to particularly outstanding and noteworthy works, but what about the rest? More likely, reviewing such works occasionally depends on unpredictable and unknown factors as far as the uninformed reader is concerned. How can we explain, for example, that reviews of a television show are published day after day with clips while another production on the same aesthetic level may be reviewed half a year later or not at all?

Reviews and essays on specific ideological-topic trends in the current artistic process as well as the process as a whole, covering a certain time period and genres have been developed in the Russian democratic press for a long time. These classical, one may say, genres of critical creativity have now withered somewhat, justified by objective difficulties. Belinskiy, it is said, could read virtually everything printed throughout the world in 1 year. Today this is beyond the reach of even the most dedicated literary worker. Who could review the nearly 300 full feature films and films for television annually produced in the country? On top of that one must also study documentaries, popular science and cartoon films, read scenarios, and so on. All of this is true. Working as a critic today is no easy matter. Something else applies, however. During Belinskiy's time there was no powerful network of scientific and research institutes and higher educational institutions dealing with the humanities, with their large philological and art chairs as exist now. They employ hundreds and thousands of highly skilled specialists. They are fully capable of and must write and publish the type of annual and monthly topical and other surveys and articles which cover comprehensively and analyze the artistic process. This does take place but only partially. Unfortunately, it is a frequent feature of literary and art institutions to become "locked within their own 'dissertational and group interests' which were mentioned at the June Central Committee Plenum. Naturally, in this case matters are not reduced to surveys and reviews, although they too are quite important. It is a question of the need radically to bring the academic and VUZ science to the current practical work of publishing houses, studios, art councils and editorial boards, and to encourage our leading scientists to write more regularly and effectively in the press on vital problems of literature and the arts.

Also worth mentioning is the fact that the critics themselves are sluggish in developing new genre forms and that the opportunities of television and the radio are quite inadequately used. In the words of Yu. V. Andropov, as elsewhere, here again we are greatly hindered by "formalism, routine, timidity and, sometimes, laziness of thought." They inevitably lead to one-sidedness and simplistic critical evaluations. To this day the stipulations in the CPSU Central Committee decree "On Literary-Artistic Criticism" remain relevant, to the effect that "published reviews are frequently one-sided. They contain unjustified compliments and are reduced to the brief retelling of the content of the work rather than discussing its real significance and value."

Naturally, the specialized journals frequently criticize works that are obviously weak. This, however, is a relatively easy matter. It is far more difficult to bring to light errors in works which as a rule are worthy of support and approval. We rarely do this, thus rendering the artist a disservice. If the work of an artist has errors they must be mentioned openly and above all in order to prevent their accumulation and, naturally, not to lower the ideological and artistic criteria of assessments, the prime significance of which was relevantly pointed out at the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum. It is equally difficult to notice what is live and promising in a piece of work which otherwise is unsuccessful.

The civic and party position and professional skill of the critic and his exacting interest in the rich development of art are clearly manifested in the live colors of a specific analysis. Faced with such analysis--unquestionably carefully made, tactful and properly weighed--basically the young beginner and the master whose name has already entered the history of art should in principle be treated as equals.

Unfortunately, in practice something else frequently happens. A new movie director, assuming that he has been liked by the critic, will be immediately proclaimed as being just about a genius and praised constantly. The incense burned in his adulation will conceal the fact that although some worthwhile innovations have been made, the style of the movie is frequently quite imitative and the ideological concept contains a great deal of falsehood and snobbery. But let us be objective. Most frequently such incense is burned in honor of the same old noted maestros. Here as well sometimes the feeling of measure and tactfulness disappears entirely. The reviewers are trying to outdo one another in their praises. As a result, we become trapped by our own praises and their inertia proves occasionally to be stronger than even the most obvious of realities.... A noted theater director may score a number of failures both on the stage and on television, something which is bitingly discussed during intermissions. However, the press remains touchingly silent or even goes so far as to publish bombastic articles praising for the umpteenth time his former successes. Naturally, these successes should not be forgotten but nor should they be used as a screen.

True respect for an artist is expressed in telling the truth about his works. Naturally, this truth may not always be to his liking. The party organizations in the creative associations should pay greater attention to the fact that some of their members are unwilling or have unlearned how to soberly

and analytically react to critical remarks which, although well-wishing and tactful, remain critical. Understandably, they do not mandatorily have to agree with all of them but nor should they ignore them. Unquestionably, the attitude of the artist toward criticism is a complex problem. It is delicate and least of all suited for an administrative solution. This makes even more important the prestigious voice of the public, the serious and frank discussion of this problem by the creative sections and at plenums and conferences or wherever artists and critics sit around the same table. So far, this is rarely done and not always on the proper practical level.

Let us also point out that occasionally even individual leaders of cultural institutions become touchy to criticism if it affects goods produced in their "own" department. Because of a misunderstood sense of the honor of the regiment, they take under their wing works which are artistically poor and helpless. In their reports and surveys such works are described almost as masterpieces of creative thinking.

Unity between content and form is the most important, the basic principle of Marxist-Leninist aesthetics and criticism. Concern for ideological meaningfulness and civic direction in art is inseparable from concern for its professional standards. The critic must speak of such things firmly and clearly. Thus, we lose a great deal from the "gigantomania" which has now spread among a significant percentage of creative workers. For example, television screening is done quite arbitrarily. A local melodramatic plot, which could simply be presented in a simple series, is sometimes expanded in television with the help of endless bridges, discussions, significantly long pauses and unnecessary panning of sites. This is boring, the viewer sensibly thinks, and turns off the set. The movie directors as well are unwilling to fall behind their television colleagues. Some of them consider it simply nonprestigious to produce a normal-length feature, insisting on two-part movies. Meanwhile, if a foreign customer so desires, the director shows no particular objection to reducing his own version, which usually does only good to the picture. The bacillus of verbosity has penetrated fiction as well, particularly in the case of historical and mystery and adventure novels. Some novels are so crowded with triteness and universally known data as to become incentives not for thought but for putting the readers to sleep.

Such phenomena which sometimes affect works which are otherwise interesting and talented, are fraught not only with unnecessary waste of money and material resources. Like any other professional error, "gigantomania" leads to damaging the ideological-educational function of art by weakening the effectiveness of its spiritual impact on the people. Yet, sometimes, we either ignore such errors or discuss them in an excessively generalized and abstract manner.

Lovers of highfalutin phraseology are still to be found among the critics. They make inordinate efforts to prove that white is white and black is black. This creates the illusion that sharp debate is under way whereas, in fact, the author tries to break through an open door.

We still come across simplified and schematic depictions of complex clashes. Unquestionably, this should be seriously and exactly criticized. In particular, the idealizing of the patriarchal way of life and of some obsolete

principles in national experience and character is inadmissible, for it invariably turns into distortions of historical truth and loss of class criteria.

The stand of exposing the so-called "ideal character" has become popular. Thirty years ago this did make sense. At that time a real danger had appeared that our artistic prose, motion pictures and paintings would become filled with some kind of imaginary "blue hero," so to say, the visible embodiment of the theory of lack of conflict. Frankly speaking, today we are not threatened in the least by an invasion of such "blue heroes" in novels, plays or motion pictures. We should rather be concerned with the artificial enhancement of darker phenomena and trends. As was legitimately noted at the June Plenum, "sometimes some authors give priority in their books or movies to the characters who have failed in their lives, who are subject to difficulties, to some kind of unbalanced, sick people." The point is not that such "sick people" do not exist. The question lies elsewhere: the artist's attitude toward them, and the erroneousness of effort to depict them as the typical representatives of the new generation of Soviet intellectuals or students, not to say members of the working class.

The June CPSU Central Committee Plenum emphasized the prime significance of the problem of the contemporary character: "...A person, a young one in particular, needs an ideal which embodies the nobility of the vital objectives, ideological convictions, industriousness and courage. Such characters do not have to be invented. They live among us." Unfortunately, the positive character is sometimes replaced by people who, although spiritually pure, are fearful and infantile. Judging by the plots of some of the plays, such people are doomed to remain pitiful failures or else to abandon their moral principles and turn into careerists, turncoat or, even under the pressure of some impudent and cynical "young supermen" who terrorize them, into criminals. This is as though there are no alternatives. This view, to put it mildly, is strange and does not correspond to the realities of our life.

On the other hand, occasionally attempts are being made artificially to complicate or even romanticize characters which are clearly negative and which, through strange ways, as wished by their authors, scenario writers and playwrights convert into magnetic "geniuses" of risk and adventure. They are modeled on the Western characters in cheap novels. Obviously, in the final account law and justice triumph. However, we remain puzzled as to who should the readers and viewers sympathize with? Those who violate or who uphold the law?

It cannot be said that the critics ignore these and other shortcuts and blunders in artistic creativity. As we pointed out, they have done a great deal to surmount and eliminate them. Nevertheless, we are frequently late with our articles, thus enabling a false trend to spread and sink roots. As directly stipulated in the resolutions of the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum, Marxist-Leninist criticism must less note than prevent and anticipate. In that case it would be able actively to influence one aesthetic process or another in the optimal early stage of its development.

Naturally, this is a complex problem the successful solution of which demands a great deal of the critics. Talent is the initial feature. We frequently

mention the basic importance of talent in terms of the artist but rarely in terms of the critic. Yet this "mobile aesthetics" is one of the most characteristic of creative labor. It combines that inseparable alloy of elements of scientific-conceptual and artistic activities. A critic must also have particularly sharp perception and developed intuition, a wealth of emotions, a vast memory, quick thinking and a sharp pen. All of this, incidentally, must be taken more profoundly and perceptively into consideration in the selection and training of critics in creative VUZs and philology and journalism schools and art study departments at universities. In particular, we must not confuse the general cultural training of graduating students with their professional gift. It is true that the former is by far easier to identify and is encountered incomparable more frequently than the latter. However, talent alone is insufficient when it comes to doing valuable work in art, not to mention criticism. Also needed are courage, willpower, honesty and industriousness, without which, as we know, even the most outstanding capabilities are depreciated and reduced to naught.

However, it is the conceptual factor and the civic stance, which determine all aesthetic assessments and judgments, that play a decisive role in the spiritual development of the critic as an ideological party worker. The importance of the conceptual factor is increasing steadily. We are living in an exceptionally difficult and conflicting time. As Comrade Yu. V. Andropov says, the current period in the life of mankind is noted by a confrontation between two totally opposite world outlooks and political courses--socialism and imperialism--of unparalleled intensity and gravity in the entire postwar period. Under such most difficult circumstances, "Soviet society," states the decree of the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "has entered a stage in which profound quality changes in production forces and corresponding improvements in production relations have become imminent. The changes in the consciousness of the people and the entire social superstructure must be closely related to this fact. The party and the people are concentrating their efforts on the planned and comprehensive advancement of developed socialism, which directly depend on the level of conscientiousness and activeness of the working people. Ideological work is increasingly assuming priority and its role and significance are growing."

All of this is directly related to literary-artistic criticism. It is only if guided by Marxist-Leninist ideology and by creatively developing and enriching the principles of socialist realism, which is a method used not only in literature but in criticism as well, as well as applying the methodology of dialectical materialism that one can profoundly and accurately understand the complex problems of contemporary social life and practices in the field of aesthetics. Equipped with the programmatic resolutions of the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum and the party documents on literature and the arts, our critics must carry high the banner of peace and socialism in artistic culture. This is the banner of progressive realistic art for the sake of the blossoming of which the Soviet critics work. This is a difficult yet honorable and responsible duty.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/6

NEW LEVELS OF COOPERATION AMONG CEMA-MEMBER COUNTRIES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 83 (signed to press 13 Dec 83) pp 52-62

[Article by Dr of Economic Sciences A. Bykov]

[Text] The 26th CPSU Congress indicated the way to the further rapprochement among the socialist countries in a variety of areas, including economic integration, which is the material base of this natural process. Essentially, the set of planned measures, which reflect the principle-minded positions of the ruling parties in the fraternal countries, is aimed at raising the integration process to a new level. The development of these interrelated long-range steps is based on the experience gained in the implementation of the comprehensive program for socialist economic integration, taking into consideration the new internal and international situation. As a whole, they are oriented toward the comprehensive intensification of the integration process and the creation of the necessary conditions to this effect on the national and international levels. This is the only way leading to the successful solution of the problem of converting to intensive economic development and the implementation of the large-scale social programs of CEMA countries, above all of those situated in Europe.

Within this complex, as was pointed out at the 26th CPSU Congress, the conversion of the forthcoming two five-year plans into a period of intensive production and scientific and technical cooperation plays a special role.

Our party's line of enhancing the effectiveness and quality of mutual cooperation among fraternal countries, including the joint solution of scientific and technical and production problems, was confirmed and developed at the November 1982 and June 1983 CPSU Central Committee plenums and the speeches delivered at them by Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary.

1

The natural development of the course charted by the fraternal parties is determined by a number of internal and external circumstances.

The linchpin of the development of the integration process was and remains the exchange of energy and raw material resources, mainly delivered by our country, against finished goods produced by the European CEMA members. This trade is and will remain of great importance today and in the future. Nevertheless, we cannot fail to realize that such a "model" limits opportunities

for improving the integration structure, developing reciprocal trade and ensuring the fuller involvement of the tremendous industrial and scientific and technical potential of the socialist countries, our country above all, in the integration process.

To the extent of its possibilities, the USSR will continue to fulfill its international duty by supplying substantial amounts of the main energy and raw material resources needed for the development of the fraternal countries, although this involves other increasing material outlays, for the largest deposits of such resources are located in the eastern and northern parts of the country. Their development in new uninhabited areas of difficult natural-weather and geological conditions and their transportation over huge distances greatly increase the specific outlays which are frequently not compensated by the significantly higher world prices of energy and many types of raw materials. Yet, as we know, the USSR supplies such resources to CEMA-member countries at prices considerably lower than those charged on the world markets.

That is why the solution of the raw material and energy problem will continue increasingly to depend on the use of energy and material conservation technology, the joint development of resources with the help of the latest equipment and technology, and the extensive utilization of alternate and diversified energy sources. This requires the acceleration of scientific and technical progress and the fast development on its basis of processing industry sectors, machine-building above all, the increased efficiency of the growing investment load and the broadening of the export base essentially by increasing the production of science-intensive goods.

Since maintaining the raw material quota (in physical terms) of Soviet exports to CEMA-member countries affects the dynamics of the overall trade with these countries, its growth can be ensured above all by increasing our deliveries of semifinished and finished goods. This calls for the further development of specialization and, particularly, cooperation of production in the processing industry sectors, mainly in machine building, chemistry, and metallurgy, where the best prerequisites for such development exist.

As confirmed by worldwide experience, cooperation in science, technology and production, which is acquiring a clearly manifested international nature, enables us to surmount the shortage of material and intellectual resources experienced by individual countries and to organize the production process on the basis of the latest achievements of science and technology, to upgrade the series production of goods and lower production and marketing costs while strengthening competitiveness on the foreign markets.

The world is fast approaching a new stage in the development of the scientific and technical revolution which, with the aggravation of the energy, raw material and ecological situation and the increased role of other global problems, will be characterized by profound structural changes in production, triggering new directions and accelerating the process of its socialization and internationalization. The microprocessor revolution, the comprehensive production automation and ecology orientation, and basic changes in the

energy and technological foundations, will provide a powerful impetus for the intensification of international specialization and cooperation, the establishment of the international scientific-production complexes and the increased science-intensiveness of output as the most important prerequisites for upgrading the progressive and competitive nature of goods.

Naturally, the CEMA-member countries cannot remain outside of this process and ignore it. They must refract the global trends through the lens of their own circumstances and the advantages offered by socialist national and collective economic management methods. With an overall scientific and technical and production potential superior to that of any capitalist country or economic group, they have real possibilities of organizing international scientific and technical and production cooperation on a broader and stronger basis and incomparably greater results for each of the participants compared to contemporary state-monopoly capitalism. This is helped by the growing extent of actual socialization of production in CEMA-member countries and the advantages of socialist internationalization and integration compared to those of imperialism.

Socialist production relations, within which the CEMA-member countries are developing their integration, exclude inequality among partners or their exploitation and essentially create unlimited opportunities for the development of unification trends consistent with the international nature of socialism. Intensive scientific, technological and production cooperation is the major form of their manifestation. Its development not only broadens the opportunities of the international division of labor but contributes to its gradual conversion into an international system of planned socialist cooperation, in which planning acts as a form of development of a direct social nature of both national and international labor. This process, however, crosses a number of stages related to the development of socialist production socialization on a national and international scale, in which the national level is primary, although it is increasingly experiencing the feedback of international (integration) conditions and requirements.

Socialist economic integration is developing above all on the macrolevel, and it is precisely on this level that cooperation has reached its highest development. In the final account, however, the microlevel will be the main area of its implementation. The direct relations on which it is based, however, have still not been properly developed.

The intensification of scientific and technical and production cooperation as an important component of the overall course pursued by the CEMA countries is motivated by another factor outside the commonwealth. During the 1970s, in an effort to accelerate the updating of their production apparatus, a number of CEMA members substantially increased their trade and cooperation relations with the West. This essentially positive trend, which is consistent with the open nature of socialist integration and relations with the international division of labor, nevertheless also triggered a number of negative phenomena which affected the pace of the integration process and its technological base. They were manifested in their most concentrated fashion in the Polish economic situation at the turn of the 1980s. Here the unbalanced

nature of relations with the West intensified the country's technological and financial dependence on extraregional sources, which contributed to the outbreak of a crisis and enabled the imperialist forces to exert economic and political pressure on the country.

The Polish lesson and the discrimination applied against CEMA countries on the Western markets, which has drastically intensified of late on the initiative and pressure of the United States, and strongest in terms of access to modern technology, call for the adoption of collective steps to strengthen the technical and economic invulnerability of the commonwealth, above all in the areas of new equipment and technology. Corresponding decisions were unanimously passed at the 37th CEMA session. The intensive scientific-technical and production cooperation among CEMA members is, along with their coordinated foreign economic policy, a firm protection of their common interests and an important means of weakening their dependence on unreliable non-regional sources and strengthening their collective technological autonomy.

II

Scientific-technical and production cooperation are increasingly blending within an organically single entity. This is related to the conversion of science into an immediate production force and its growing integration with the production process. At the same time, the individual components of this complex have their own specific nature which justifies their interrelated yet relatively independent consideration.

The scientific and technical cooperation among the fraternal countries is achieved through coordination, cooperation and joint implementation of research projects and exchange of their results and interaction in the development of a scientific and technical infrastructure (inventions and patents, training scientific cadres, scientific and technical information, standardization and scientific instrument making). It is rooted in the very initial period of the establishment of the international socialist division of labor and forms today within it a dynamically developing trend. Bilateral and, subsequently, multilateral forms of cooperation were organized and developed step by step; its planning and cost-accounting instruments were improved; a gradual reorientation took place from purely training operations to interaction in research and, within it, research based on coordination and cooperation.

Socialist economic integration accelerated this transformation and gave it a more purposeful and planned nature. In playing a growing role in resolving problems of scientific and technical progress which is frequently simply impossible in the case of some countries, particularly of small size and with limited resources, reciprocal cooperation contributed to the shaping and development of national scientific and technical potentials and their interaction in the formulation of the actual trends followed in basic and applied research and the utilization of their results.

In the course of the implementation of the comprehensive program for socialist economic integration some 20,000 scientific results were obtained through

multilateral cooperation. Sixty-three coordination centers were created for the most important trends of scientific and technical development, together with a number of joint institutes, laboratories and task forces of specialists; more than 100 multilateral agreements were concluded for the solution of specific major problems, and as many within the framework of long-term target programs for cooperation (DTsPS), covering periods of 10 to 15 years. The foundations were laid for patent integration. An international system of scientific and technical information was created and an accord was concluded on unified CEMA standards. Cooperation in the training of scientific cadres and in scientific instrument manufacturing was expanded. All of this enables us to speak of a developing fruitful process of scientific and technical integration as the most important link within the entire integration process of CEMA-member countries.

However, no sharp turn toward the intensification of this cooperation has been made fully. So far it is developing primarily in width, covering more than 3,000 national research organizations which are contributing on more than 4,000 topics of basic and applied nature. The essentially traditional coordination methods are still being used while the more effective ones such as contractual cooperation and joint research, still account for a rather modest share; few joint collectives, laboratories and scientific-production associations have been created (the share of cooperation in scientific and technical combined projects does not exceed 10 percent and the only international scientific production association, Interetalonpribor, has still not fully developed as such in the true meaning of the term). Cooperation effectiveness is adversely affected by its scattered nature among a number of channels and trends, organizational and economic separation from production-investment and trade interaction and weakness of the application area which is virtually excluded from cooperation, as well as the underdeveloped nature of cost accounting and contractual relations and material and moral incentives based on practical (collective in particular) mastery and utilization of highly effective solutions. The reasons for all this are found above all in the underdeveloped nature of the mechanism of scientific and technical progress (both national and integrational).

As was pointed out at the November 1982 and June 1983 CPSU Central Committee plenums, our enterprises are not only being insufficiently encouraged but even frequently economically penalized for the application of technical innovations, for which reason they sometimes tend to avoid them. They do not seek means for the most economical solution of problems related to scientific and technical progress, including cooperation with the fraternal countries, frequently relying on imports of items already developed by Western technology, although this is not in all cases the most effective technical and economic method. Furthermore, the very organization of cooperation is still frequently facing procedural difficulties which could make even enthusiasts unwilling to undertake it. Similar problems face the fraternal countries as well, although in a number of cases positive experience has been acquired in this area.

The very fact that the fraternal parties raised the question of making the next two five-year plans a period of intensive production and scientific and

technical cooperation reflects the objective necessity to integrate science with production with the help of extensive and comprehensive cooperation methods. On the organizational-economic level this presumes the development of socialist integration in this area in two interrelated directions.

On the macroeconomic and intergovernmental level, which determines the main trends of the integration process, it is a question of expanding plan coordination with a coordinated economic policy as a whole. Its most important component, along with ensuring the balanced nature of economic development and reciprocal cooperation among CEMA-member countries, and the formulation of a long-term structural strategy for the commonwealth, is a coordination in the area of scientific and technical policy. Based on the trends of the scientific and technical revolution, and earmarked the outlines of future structural changes, it is possible to formulate a long-range system of priorities which should dominate the collective resources and efforts, in accordance with the common tasks and the features governing the development of the individual countries.

Such a coordinated policy, in our view, would call for setting up a preferential regimen for the solution of priority problems; the elimination of duplication and minor topics; ensuring a conversion to more efficient forms of cooperated solution of the most important problems of science and technology; basing such solution on a program-target systemic approach which will enable us to optimize the combination of scientific and technical, production, labor and investment factors within and, partially (whenever justified), intra-regional nature with a joint guideline leading to end results. The latter would include the efficient application of scientific results obtained in the course of such cooperation and, particularly, the organization, on their basis, of the production of series of competitive superior quality goods within the shortest possible time for marketing on the CEMA marketplace and, if possible, on a global scale. Particular attention should be paid here to trends in which we have already acquired a scientific base which will enable us to make a breakthrough toward more distant scientific and technical levels and offer on the market essentially new goods different from anything else produced in the world.

In this connection, it is important accurately to assess not only the scientific stock already owned by the commonwealth and to determine the efficient ways for its integration utilization, but also to create conditions for its steady further growth on the basis of a coordinated contribution by all fraternal countries, based on their actual possibilities and common interests. In this connection, it becomes necessary to ensure the optimal combination of the evolutionary and revolutionary ways of scientific and technical progress. It is precisely the latter that enables us to create and apply essentially new and most efficient equipment and technology and to ensure for the commonwealth as a whole a primarily pioneering trend in scientific and technical developments, combined with less capital-intensive but also less effective evolutionary ways, aimed at resolving primarily current problems. All of this, in turn, will create conditions for the optimal development and interaction among the national scientific and technical potentials and their specialization within the integrated potential of the commonwealth.

Coordination on the sectorial and subsectorial levels is as important as coordination of scientific and technical policy on the macroeconomic level. This would enable us to ensure common development concepts and cooperation in scientific research and the application of its results. It will help us to create the necessary technological unity of cooperated production facilities and to contribute to the development of stable long-term relations of intrasectorial nature. The importance of technological unity among the cooperating countries is confirmed, for example, by the experience gained in cooperation in the production of machine tools with digital programming: the unadaptability of individual parts, including those produced by the fraternal countries on the basis of Western licenses, complicated the implementation of already reached agreements.

The scientific and technical potential is the most important component of the national wealth and demands its thrifty utilization within national as well as integrational and broader international boundaries. To this effect, therefore, we must comprehensively improve the planning-organizational and cost-accounting methods of trading and related cooperation operations. The purpose of a coordinated policy is to encompass all trends of scientific and technical exchanges. It is also a question of exchanging technology with the West. We must eliminate duplication and unjustified purchases of duplicated equipment when the possibility exists of producing the same or even better items on the basis of the potential available to the socialist commonwealth. Clearly, part of coordination will be establishing an organic connection between imported technologies and integration measures under way and their systematic orientation toward higher technical standards. The negative trends which appeared in the area of extraregional exchanges in the 1970s, the aggravated international situation and the increased discrimination against the socialist countries on Western markets prove that this is a problem affecting our entire commonwealth and its individual members, requiring an efficient collective solution.

Today the center of gravity in cooperation relations has shifted to the level of ministries and enterprises. Their prerogatives in this area have been considerably broadened of late in virtually all fraternal countries although to a different extent. Direct relations are becoming the main trend in the development of scientific-technical and production cooperation within the framework of a coordinated policy. The initiative and competence of the primary unit become particularly important in terms of selecting the optimal directions and forms of such cooperation and taking it to its final completion. Practical experience indicates that the best results are achieved when relations among countries are based on a proper consideration of reciprocal interests and advantages and their ability to introduce into such cooperation a contribution consistent with such benefits. In this area economic contracts play a major role, for they establish reciprocal obligations and responsibilities based on a strong cost-accounting foundation.

On the basis of applied industrial studies scientific and technical cooperation naturally tends to develop into comprehensive cooperation which encompasses development, production, investments and marketing, as well as subsequent technical servicing, i.e., the entire reproduction cycle. Such a

comprehensive approach is still being used on a limited basis; no more than a few of the agreements for scientific and technical cooperation concluded in the 1970s called for the development of prototypes and engaging in joint developments and series production. However, the development and extensive application of such a system would enable us significantly to upgrade the efficiency of cooperation relations. It will accelerate and expand the scale of utilization of results (which, so far, has been essentially left to the individual cooperating countries); it will enhance the technical level of goods produced on the basis of specialization and cooperation and coordinate the parameters of such production with the need of the marketplace. According to applied research, the results of which can be preprogrammed with relative accuracy, such comprehensive cooperation should be included from the very beginning in the respective agreements and economic contracts. When it becomes a question of research, production-investment-marketing units could be included after the research stage has led to results ready for industrial development.

The experience gained in the most successful comprehensive solutions such as, for example, designing and producing third-generation "Ryad" system computers, proves that such large-scale projects bring to life powerful international scientific-production complexes which operate on a common organizational-management and technological basis which ensures the unity of approaches and solutions and the efficient interaction among national research and production organizations participating in such cooperation.

It can be assumed that establishing such scientific-production and production-technical complexes (depending on which of their constituent components is leading) is a natural phenomenon in the integration process. The cooperation relations which develop here rise to a qualitatively new organizational and technological level. The creation and functioning of such complexes could take the shape, in our view, of long-term programs for scientific and technical progress (within the DTsPS or as their supplement), developed and implemented on the basis of a representative target competent organ set up by the cooperating countries. As to specific problems, they can be clearly given their scientific and technical development within machine building, as defined as being most important at the 34th CEMA Session, the conclusion of large-scale agreements in the field of nuclear machine building, microelectronics, robotics and other priority directions coordinated among CEMA members and projects such as, for example, gene engineering and biotechnology, comprehensive production automation, waste-free technology and environmental protection equipment.

Along with the national organizations and enterprises, such complexes could include individual combined units (scientific and technical, design-engineering, application, or servicing-marketing). This prepares the grounds for the development of such complexes into international cost-accounting scientific-production and production associations operating on the basis of a combined (share) ownership on the production level and acting as a single joint company. Such complexes, which meet the growing needs of CEMA-member countries for contemporary science-intensive output, could become in the future an important link in strengthening the positions of CEMA members on the world

markets and blocking in them and, above all, in the developing countries, the increasing economic and technological expansion of the monopolies.

The creation of a corresponding integrated infrastructure to this effect is a major prerequisite for the intensification of scientific and technical cooperation among CEMA-member countries. It is a question of broadening the common normative base, mainly by applying CEMA standards and concluding the agreement currently under way on a unified protection document and thus intensifying patent integration, and creating a joint bank for technologies and intermediary firms which will help to find suitable cooperating units both in science and technology and in production and marketing and will help to develop and implement such activities through the exchange of relations of cooperation. The time has also come to set up a single marketing base for scientific instruments and equipment. It would be useful to all international (within CEMA) competitions for best designs and technical solutions; a great role could be played by international application collectives and consulting-technical firms. All of this would facilitate the migration of scientific and technical factors within the commonwealth, the concentration and their cooperative utilization. A kind of socialist common market for technology would be formed which would operate on a planned basis combined with economic incentive.

III

Production specialization and cooperation played a particular role in the economic cooperation among CEMA-member countries. In implementing the comprehensive program, during the 1970s the CEMA-member countries did extensive work to develop and improve their organizational forms. About 120 multilateral and more than 1,000 bilateral production specialization and cooperation agreements were concluded. On that basis reciprocal procurements among CEMA-member countries increased from 330 million rubles in 1970 to 25 billion in 1980. About three-quarters of the commodities included in specialization agreements are produced by no more than two countries and some 45 percent of the total by a single one. As a result, a number of CEMA countries have abandoned the ineffective production of goods, importing them from the specialized countries within the commonwealth and focusing their efforts and resources on the production of goods which they can accomplish more efficiently and once again in accordance with the needs of the entire commonwealth.

Despite the relatively high level of specialization of CEMA-member countries in a number of processing industry sectors, machine building above all, the scale of such specialization remains inadequate. So far it is item specialization, the possibilities and results of which are relatively limited, that is essentially being developed. As to the essentially limitless and most efficient part and assembly and technological specializations, they account for between 10 to a maximum of 15 percent of specialized procurements. This proves that the level of production cooperation is still clearly insufficient and, furthermore, is still dominated by its simplest form--the delivery of assemblies and parts in exchange for finished goods.

Specialization developed considerably more on the basis of the already mastered production of goods, frequently falling behind world standards in terms of technical and economic parameters. Meanwhile, the growing requirements for progressive equipment were increasingly being satisfied through imports from the capitalist countries, increasing their share in the overall imports of machines and equipment. In the agreements currently being signed little attention is still being paid to improving the technical standards of specialized goods and the development of scientific and technical cooperation needed to this effect, including licensing operations. This, in turn, could lead to a stagnation in the technical standards already reached. In the overall volume of specialization and cooperation the production of new goods does not as yet exceed 10 percent.

Specialization and, particularly, cooperation in new production trends offer the broadest opportunities. As the production of progressive commodities is mastered, production capacities become updated and profound long-term interrelationships are developed along the entire "science-technology-production-marketing" chain. This precisely is the direction of the DTsPS and the development of large-scale accords they include, such as those in the field of nuclear machine building, robotics and microelectronics. Their implementation will enable us to create virtually new production trends in CEMA-member countries, based on a common technological foundation, to resolve topical problems such as the rationalization of the energy base, production automation and reducing within it the share of manual labor.

Essentially, a more progressive production structure and labor division and cooperation is being established here. It takes into consideration the growing requirements of CEMA-member countries and the possibilities of their machine-building complexes; the latter become efficiently specialized within the framework of a single cooperation system covering dozens of national production and scientific research organizations. At the same time the level of international socialization of production and labor rises and the scientific and technical, investment and production efforts of the individual countries, related to such a structural reorganization, are optimized. The possibilities and scale of reciprocal trade are broadened; its structure is improved and dependence on nonregional sources of necessary equipment is weakened; prerequisites are created for strengthening the positions within the system of the global division of labor.

This becomes particularly important under contemporary conditions, when imports of equipment from the West have become more difficult as a result of intensified discrimination against a number of CEMA-member countries and the high indebtedness of the latter because of previous purchases; the presentation of their own goods on the world markets has been hindered as a result of the aggravated competition caused by a drastic worsening of the world economic circumstances. All of this must be taken thoroughly into consideration in developing cooperation among CEMA-member countries which are trying to rationalize their economic structure in order to make a more efficient use of available capacities and, at the same time, balance commodity flows within and outside CEMA.

Such cooperation is also contributive to the inclusion of less-developed CEMA-member countries, which accelerates their production and technical development and contributes to the gradual orientation of their economic standards. This is exemplified by the organization of complementing goods for computers in Cuba within the framework of agreements in the field of micro-electronics.

Along with the multilateral programs, the implementation of bilateral long-term programs for production specialization and cooperation, supplementing the DTsPS and determining the strategy of bilateral cooperation for the 1980s, is of great importance. For example, based on the general plan for specialization and cooperation in the field of material production, the USSR and Bulgaria are planning the creation of new models of metal-cutting machine tools with digital programming, electric and motor-powered lifts, caterpillar tractors for viticulture, and others. Cooperation will be of a comprehensive nature and will include research and design and engineering development, including the exchange of scientific and technical results and the production of new machines and equipment based on joint development, as well as the coordination of capital investments.

Similar to the DTsPS the bilateral programs are being implemented on the basis of agreements on cooperation and coordination of national economic plans, the purpose of which is to ensure unity between the production and foreign trade aspects of the implemented measures within the assignments of the national plans. In terms of multilateral cooperation, the latter is ensured by coordinated plans for multilateral integration measures drafted for the second consecutive five-year period.

However, practical experience proves that the planning-organizational and economic aspects of specialization and, particularly, production cooperation are still significantly lagging behind the requirements of the time. The establishment of efficient and stable production and technical relations among enterprises of the fraternal countries is held back by the underdeveloped nature of horizontal relations on the national and international levels, the multilevel coordination of the problems of their organization and implementation, an orientation still primarily directed toward short-term solutions, and the inadequate incentive given to the development of such relations at various economic management levels. Their development is also adversely affected by the rapid development of price-setting systems for assemblies and parts, disparity between wholesale prices of export goods and payments for imports within the countries, based on global contractual prices which are used in settling accounts among CEMA-member countries. Another factor is the unregulated nature of intersectorial relations on the national and integration levels, the lack of adaptation of the structure of CEMA organs to managing comprehensive cooperation of complexes exceeding the framework of a single sector and a weak contractual-technological discipline.

Orientation toward high technical standards and competitiveness is of particular importance in a successful cooperation project, without which the goods cannot be successfully marketed either within CEMA or on a global scale.

It is clear, therefore, that scientific and technical cooperation efficient in terms of ways of methods and synchronized in terms of stage becomes an organic element in cooperated production relations. An important part of it is the elaboration of uniform progressive standards and technical conditions and a common technological base, including quality control. Frequently a specializing country, a small one in particular, cannot ensure by itself the necessary modernization of output and the enhancement of its technical standard or else the necessary new developments. This must become the concern of all members of the cooperative effort, including the consumers, who are as interested as the producers in making the cooperation program consistent from beginning to end with modern requirements in all parameters. The existence of built-in obstacles to the production of substandard goods and measures which stimulate the increased quality of output is absolutely necessary.

The advantages of production cooperation are obvious. However, doubts are frequently expressed regarding its expediency; references are made to the great organizational and technological complexity of such cooperation and the difficulty of optimizing the advantages accruing the participants. Unquestionably, the organization of cooperative production as a higher form of cooperation requires increased efforts and a synchronized interaction among the parties on the basis of program-target methods and joint planning which, in turn, involves expanding direct relations, bringing closer to each other the economic mechanisms of CEMA-member countries, increasing the reciprocal responsibility for their realization, and so on. However, all of this is worth doing, for the results are exceptionally great. As to the second argument, a possible solution may be sought in the proper consideration and distribution among all participants of both outlays and benefits of such cooperation through the improvement of reciprocal account clearing and price setting for complementing and finished products and the optimal distribution among the cooperating countries of functions of suppliers of complementing goods and finished products. Obviously, we should not exclude the use of the competitiveness factor in the production of finished goods by several cooperating units, particularly in cases of extensive production volumes.

The fraternal countries must engage in even more joint work in order to implement the trends of intensification of scientific and technical and production cooperation and to improve the mechanism of the integration process established by the CPSU and the other fraternal parties. In this connection, a rapprochement among the structures of economic mechanisms, particularly of their foreign economy units, assumes great importance. This requires a systematic exchange of experience in economic management. A great deal must be done also to develop direct relations which are still short of flexibility and efficiency in the elaboration and implementation of coordinated programs; we must upgrade the interest of participants engaged in direct relations in their fullest and most effective utilization. A great deal here depends also on the initiative and organized activities of CEMA-member organs and other joint organizations.

Essentially, the ideas formulated by the fraternal parties deal with the need for radical improvements in the mechanism of integration interaction and of relating it better to national economic management mechanisms. It is a question of the coordinated introduction within such a mechanism of anything

which ensures their coordinated intensive development, a development based on the advantages and opportunities for reciprocally complementing and unifying the efforts and resources of the fraternal countries. The successful solution of these problems which will unquestionably be helped by the forthcoming summit meeting on economic problems will enable us to support economically and organizationally the course of intensification of production and scientific and technical cooperation and of advancing, in accordance with acquired experience, the ways and means of joint economic management. Its implementation will contribute to the active harnessing of sources of intensive development at the disposal of our commonwealth this very decade.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/6

NEW AGREEMENT TESTED BY LIFE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 83 (signed to press 13 Dec 83) pp 63-68

[Article by V. Kuz'min and R. Lozhnikov]

[Text] In December 1983 the Soviet and Czechoslovak peoples are celebrating a noted anniversary in the history of the relations between the two countries: the 40th anniversary of the signing of the Friendship, Mutual Aid and Postwar Cooperation Treaty Between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia. The conclusion of this treaty was the result of all preceding developments in Soviet-Czechoslovak relations. It was a legitimate manifestation of the historically developed relations and linguistic and cultural closeness between two Slavic nations, their traditional feelings of friendship and the closeness between the basic national interests of the USSR and Czechoslovakia.

The Great October Socialist Revolution created favorable conditions for the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy and the national liberation movement of the Czechs and Slovaks was crowned by the establishment of an independent state--the Czechoslovak Republic--in 1918. The Czechoslovak working class actively supported the first state of workers and peasants in the world. In expressing the expectations and progressive traditions of the people, the Czechoslovak working class, headed by the communists, persistently called for a rapprochement with Soviet Russia and for establishing close cooperation with it.

This factually developing class alliance between the working people of Czechoslovakia and the land of the soviets clashed with the official position of the bourgeoisie, which had acceded to power and which pursued a hostile policy toward the young Soviet republic, avoided for a long time establishing diplomatic relations with it and did everything possible to hinder the development of economic and cultural relations and the dissemination of the truth about the USSR. In pursuing the course of the imperialist countries, the ruling circles of bourgeois Czechoslovakia actively participated in the plans for the creation of an anti-Soviet "cordon sanitaire." The appearance of the threat of aggression by German fascism in the 1930s changed the situation in Europe. The Soviet Union mounted a struggle for the creation of a collective security system in Europe. The real threat to the very existence of the Czechoslovak state and the increased reputation of the land of the soviets forced the bourgeois government to heed the demands of the Czechoslovak working people and establish an alliance with the USSR. In 1934 Czechoslovakia granted de jure recognition of the Soviet state and established diplomatic relations with it. On the following year a Czechoslovak-Soviet mutual aid

treaty was concluded in the aftermath of the conclusion of a Soviet-French treaty.

The conclusion of a treaty of alliance with the USSR strengthened the positions of the peace-loving countries which favored the organized rebuff of the aggressor. It strengthened the position of Czechoslovakia in the face of the threat presented by fascist Germany. However, whereas the CzCP and the Czechoslovak working people saw in this act a turn toward ensuring the security of the country and its national independence, the ruling circles treated it as a political maneuver and continued in their practical policy to rely on France and England. This precisely was the meaning of the stipulation introduced by Benes in the 1935 Soviet-Czechoslovak Treaty, which made giving aid to Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union dependent on the French position.

However, the Western countries, which pursued a policy of urging Hitlerite Germany on to the east, against the USSR, sacrificed Czechoslovakia and agreed to its dismemberment in accordance with the Munich accord which resulted in the total enslavement of this country in 1939. During the tragic days of the Munich betrayal the Soviet Union was the only country which proved in fact its loyalty as an ally. It expressed readiness to give military aid to Czechoslovakia to repel the fascist aggression regardless of the French position. The rulers of Czechoslovakia preferred to capitulate to the Western countries.

The cost of the Munich treachery was high: 6 years of suffering under Hitlerite yoke and the lives of thousands of Czechs and Slovaks tortured in fascist jails. The Czechoslovak people drew the proper lessons from this tragedy. They realized that the freedom, independence and very existence of their country were impossible within a coalition with the imperialist Western countries. This could be accomplished only by relying on the Soviet Union. That is why during the dark years of occupation the working people did not surrender to the Hitlerite aggressors but, under the leadership of the communist party, launched a resistance movement, firmly believing and hoping that it was precisely the powerful Soviet people who would crush the aggressor and restore to Czechoslovakia its lost freedom.

The entry by the Soviet Union into the struggle against the fascist aggressor, its proclaimed task of liberating the peoples of Europe and the brilliant victories won by the Soviet army at Moscow, Stalingrad and the Kursk Arc proved that the Soviet Union was able to defeat through its own forces the Hitlerite hordes and to liberate the countries of Eastern Europe. The Czechoslovak battalion, which soon became a brigade and, subsequently, a corps, under the command of L. Svoboda, came to fight the fascist aggressors, equipped with Soviet arms, shoulder to shoulder with the Soviet troops, in 1943.

The futility of the hopes expressed by Benes and the Czechoslovak government in exile in London of having the country occupied by the Anglo-American forces became obvious following the headlong offensive mounted by the Soviet army as it approached the borders of Czechoslovakia and the development of the national liberation struggle of the Czechs and Slovaks headed by the CzCP.

The Friendship, Mutual Aid and Postwar Cooperation Treaty Between the USSR and Czechoslovakia was initialed in the Kremlin on 12 December 1943. This act was considered by M. I. Kalinin, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, a historical stage in the development of the traditional friendship between the peoples of the two countries and an important contribution to the common struggle against German fascism.

This treaty, which was concluded at the very peak of the war, expressed the inflexible resolve of the peoples of the USSR and Czechoslovakia to ensure the total routing of fascism. It established forever the combat alliance between the Soviet and Czechoslovak nations. The stipulations of the treaty were the base for increased Soviet military aid to the guerrilla movement in Czechoslovakia and the coordination of its activities with those of the Soviet army. This contributed to the further energizing of the national liberation struggle waged by the Czechoslovak people. The friendship between the peoples of the two countries was consolidated not only by the treaty itself but also by the jointly shed blood in the sacred war against the common enemy at the battles of Sokolovo and Belaya Tserkva, at Kiev, Dukla and Ostrava, in the mountains of Slovakia and the streets of Prague. At the high cost of more than 140,000 casualties in the battles for the liberation of Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union rescued millions of Czechs and Slovaks from the destruction prepared for them by the fascists. The USSR fulfilled the first part of the contract entirely by completing the liberation of Czechoslovakia.

The importance of the treaty lay not only in the fact that it guaranteed the rebirth of a sovereign Czechoslovak republic but also that it defeated the plans of international reaction, which was trying to restore the anti-Soviet "cordon sanitaire" on the Western borders of the Soviet Union. It marked a radical turn in Czechoslovak foreign policy, previously oriented toward imperialist countries in Western Europe and the United States. It marked the victory of the line followed by the working class and the CzCP with the national liberation struggle. K. Gottwald described the significance of the treaty as follows: "Our national ship of state has found a safe harbor."

The orientation toward a close alliance with the USSR became the cornerstone of Czechoslovak foreign policy. The second part of the treaty included essentially new foundations for postwar relations between the two countries. It codified the policy of "permanent friendship and friendly postwar cooperation," and the resolve "to develop to the broadest possible extent economic relations" based on the principles of noninterference in reciprocal domestic affairs and reciprocal respect for independence and sovereignty.

For the first time the treaty emphasized the need for combining the efforts of both countries in the defense of their interests against a possible aggression by world imperialism. The treaty called for joint actions to block aggression on the part of imperialist Germany or its allies in the future. It thus guaranteed the necessary external conditions for the Czechoslovak people to be able to control its own fate freely.

The conclusion of this pact was a major success for the CzCP which, ever since its creation, had actively promoted the establishment of relations of

friendship and alliance between Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union. "Our peoples which have struggled for their existence for centuries can now rest and calmly undertake the building of a new and happier future," said K. Gottwald, speaking on Radio Moscow. "The dreams of the greatest philosophers of our peoples have come true: our Slavic lime tree rests against the powerful Russian and Slavic oak. Such, dear friends, is the meaning of the profound significance of the historical Moscow treaty of 12 December 1943 both to us and to future generations. After the fall of the Hitlerite tyranny, and after the foreign aggressors have been expelled from our homeland, and after the liberation of our republic, this treaty will ensure our full security from the outside and free our hands so that we may concentrate all our forces on building a new and happy life in free and independent Czechoslovakia" (Klement Gottwald, "Izbr. Proizv." [Selected Works], vol II, Moscow, 1957, pp 40-41). The conclusion of the 1943 treaty unquestionably created more favorable conditions for the further strengthening of the revolutionary and all truly democratic forces in Czechoslovakia, which linked its future development to profound socioeconomic changes.

The first program for restored Czechoslovakia, which was passed in April 1945 in Kosice, and which was subsequently known as the Kosice Government Program, was based on the spirit and letter of this treaty. It stated the following: "The 12 December 1943 Friendship, Mutual Aid and Postwar Cooperation Treaty signed between Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union will continue to determine the foreign policy position of our state. The liberation of the Czechoslovak republic will be completed with the help of the Soviet Union so that, with its help, its safety and security will be ensured forever and so that, with the comprehensive cooperation of the Soviet Union, the peaceful development and happy future of the peoples of Czechoslovakia can be ensured."

The practical implementation of the stipulations of this contract and cooperation between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia intensified on a bilateral and multilateral basis within CEMA and the Warsaw Pact. During the period of transition from capitalism to socialism the CzCP and the Czechoslovak working people faced such difficult tasks as the assertion of the party's leading role in the state and society under the conditions of an industrially developed country; the strengthening and intensification of the alliance among the working class, the cooperated peasantry and all working people; the building of a socialist economy on a planned basis and the organization of a true people's management of industry and agriculture; the shaping of a socialist culture; and the development of a new outlook in the people. Under the complex international situation which prevailed at that time and the cold war atmosphere, which was imposed on the world by the imperialist circles headed by the United States, the struggle against the forces of domestic and foreign reaction was an important task.

Imperialist powers actively tried and are still trying to pull Czechoslovakia, which is so important from the strategic viewpoint, out of the family of the socialist commonwealth. They intensified their pressure substantially in the 1960s. It was precisely at that time, as the familiar CzCP Central Committee document "Lessons From the Crisis Development in the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and the Society After the Third Congress of the CzCP" stipulates, that efforts were made in Czechoslovakia to misinterpret and undermine

the 1943 treaty and the Soviet-Czechoslovak alliance. Internal and external reaction tried to eliminate the foundations of socialism, violate the fraternal alliance between Czechoslovakia and the USSR and to turn the course of the country's historical development back. This negative process developed into the 1968-1969 crisis and the direct offensive mounted by the counter-revolution.

However, the domestic and international reactionary conspiracy was defeated. The 1943 treaty passed this test of strength. The Czechoslovak people, headed by the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary nucleus of the CzCP and relying on the international aid of the Soviet Union and the other socialist states defeated the plans of the counterrevolutionary right-wing opportunistic forces and international reaction.

An end was put to the crisis development following the election of a new CzCP leadership in April 1969, headed by Comrade Gustav Husak. A program was formulated for systematic political consolidation of the society based on strengthening the leading role of the working class and its vanguard, the CzCP. Steps were taken to purge the ranks of the party from alien elements and tasks were formulated for the further comprehensive intensification of fraternal relations with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. By then the question of a new Soviet and Czechoslovak alliance treaty came up. Soviet-Czechoslovak friendship and cooperation had assumed a deeper content in all realms of bilateral relations and had been enriched on the basis of the principles of socialist internationalism and loyalty to the ideas of Marxism-Leninism. With a view to the further strengthening of cooperation between the two countries, the 25th anniversary of Czechoslovakia's liberation from the Hitlerite aggressors was celebrated with the conclusion of a new Friendship, Mutual Aid and Postwar Cooperation Treaty Between the USSR and Czechoslovakia, which was initialed in Prague on 6 May 1970.

The preamble to the treaty stated that the parties undertook jointly to strengthen and defend the socialist gains, i.e., to fulfill the common international duty of the socialist countries and firmly to defend the unity of all members of the socialist commonwealth. This stipulation became the cornerstone of relations of alliance between the USSR and Czechoslovakia and is also a manifestation of the fact that both countries realize their responsibility to the socialist commonwealth, the international communist and worker movements and mankind at large, for strengthening the unity of the socialist countries means strengthening the main link within the anti-imperialist front and is a basic guarantee for peace.

The new international situation was reflected in the 1963 protocol, which extended the Friendship, Mutual Aid and Postwar Cooperation Treaty of 1943 by another 20 years. It was expressed even more clearly from the class viewpoint in the 6 May 1970 treaty in which the contracting parties declared their profound conviction that the inviolable friendship between Czechoslovakia and the USSR, strengthened through the joint struggle against fascism and further intensified in the course of building socialism and communism, and the fraternal mutual aid and comprehensive cooperation based on Marxism-Leninism and the inviolable principle of socialist internationalism, are consistent with the basic interests of the peoples of both countries and the

entire socialist commonwealth. In accordance with the treaty, both countries deem it their international duty jointly to defend the socialist gains, security and independence of the two countries. The treaty emphasizes that both parties will immediately grant all possible aid, including military, should either of them be subject to armed attack by any country or group of countries.

These treaty stipulations become particularly topical today, when by the fault of the most aggressive imperialist circles, headed by the present U.S. administration, the international situation has drastically worsened and a real threat to peace has been created. The imperialist doctrine of nuclear war is countered by the socialist states with a struggle for peace and universal security based on the development of peaceful cooperation among countries and disarmament. V. I. Lenin himself emphasized that disarmament is the ideal of socialism. This is precisely the course pursued by the USSR, Czechoslovakia and the other fraternal countries as they formulate constructive proposals aimed at restraining the arms race. "Our objective," said Comrade Yu. V. Andropov at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "is not simply to prevent a war. We are aspiring toward a radical improvement of international relations and toward strengthening and developing all good principles within such relations. We shall encourage respect for the sovereign rights of countries and peoples and the strict observance of the principles of international law which imperialism is trying with increasing frequency to reject and violate."

No one should interpret the good will shown by the Soviet Union and its aspiration to reach agreements as a symptom of weakness. The USSR will be able to respond to any effort to disturb the current rough balance of military power in Europe, including nuclear, and its words will not differ from its actions. Neither the American militarists nor their Western European allies should nurture illusions to the effect that their attack of the socialist commonwealth would enable the aggressor to enjoy impunity or that anyone overseas, having unleashed a nuclear conflagration, could remain safe, observing from a distance events taking place on the European theater of military operations. This was most emphatically stated in Comrade Yu. V. Andropov's 24 November 1983 declaration. We are currently witnessing the exceptionally patient, persistent yet invariably principle-minded aspiration of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries to achieve a just agreement based on the principles of equality and identical security for both very large military groups. Our proposals, however, are being comprehensively rejected by the U.S. administration, which has undertaken to deploy first-strike nuclear missiles in Europe. The position assumed by the governments of the FRG, Great Britain and Italy uniformly proves that despite the will of their own nations and ignoring the interests of the security of their countries and those of European and universal peace, by giving a "green light" to the installation of American missiles, these governments have assumed, along with the U.S. government, the full responsibility for the consequences of such a short-sighted policy.

As we know, some of the new American missiles will be deployed on FRG territory 180 kilometers away from the borders of Czechoslovakia. All of these

missiles will be targeted on vitally important sites in the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia and other socialist countries.

On the basis of the existing situation and governed by a feeling of responsibility for the safety of their countries, and invariably aspiring toward peace, the governments of the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia and the GDR resolved to accelerate preparations, which were initiated some time ago and which were made public, for the deployment on their territory of operative-tactical increased range complexes as a retaliatory measure for the deployment of the new American missiles in Western Europe. As was noted in the resolutions of the November 1983 CzCP Central Committee Plenum, the Czechoslovak people support the steps taken to strengthen the defense capability and security of the members of the socialist commonwealth, for defending the homeland is a sacred matter which deeply affects every individual. This is yet another embodiment of the stipulations of the 1970 treaty which imbues the traditions of friendship and cooperation codified in the treaty of the now-distant 1943. Today this means the collective defense of socialist gains and a collective struggle for the preservation of peace and disarmament.

The CPSU and the CzCP, the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia, are profoundly interested in improving the international situation and preventing a nuclear war. Together with the other fraternal countries and all progressive mankind they are doing everything possible and necessary to block any sliding toward the precipice of nuclear catastrophe. This was clearly announced at the 26th CPSU and 16th CzCP congresses.

In appraising the role which the Soviet Union played in the destiny of Czechoslovakia, Comrade G. Husak emphasized that "the firm and unbreakable alliance between the peoples of Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union was created in the struggle against the common enemy. The working people of our country acquired a selfless friend in the Soviet Union, with whom we are bound by the unity of ideas and objectives, a reliable partner in cooperation in the economic, cultural and other areas and, above all, an undefeatable bulwark for our national and state safety. The slogan of Klement Gottwald, the outstanding leader of the Czechoslovak and international communist movement, "With the Soviet Union Forever" has become the credo of all our working people."

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/6

FIRST VICTORY OVER FASCISM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 83 (signed to press 13 Dec 83) pp 69-77

[Article by Ernst Henry written on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Leipzig trial]

[Text] Half a century has passed since the Leipzig trial and the case of the burning of the Reichstag. Today, an entire age later, we can fully appreciate the significance of this historical and essentially first victory over fascism, won by Georgi Dimitrov and all democratic and progressive forces on earth.

The burning of the Reichstag, naturally, was not simply a monstrous Nazi crime. It concealed a most important political plan of the German fascists. In order to understand what Hitler was gambling on at that time we must recall the deployment of class forces in Germany on the eve of the fire, which took place on 27 February 1933.

Although during the month which preceded it, with the help of the monopolists and the military, Hitler had been able to take the power from von Hindenburg, he still could not consider himself a full dictator. The Hitlerites had no majority in the country. A total of 3.1 percent of the voters had voted for the Nazis; the communist and social democrats together accounted for 37.2% at the 6 November 1932 elections for the Reichstag. It was only the lack of unity between the left-wing forces which prevented at that time the German working class to take the political initiative away from the advancing reaction. The Nazis were in power but feared its loss. There are substantial indications to the effect that had the combat unity between communists and social democrats been achieved at that point the Nazi regime would have hardly withstood, in the same way that after the general strike of 1920 the Kapp and Ludendorff conspiratorial group, which had seized Berlin, had been unable to remain in power. The Nazis remembered this well.

Nor were their positions strong in the international arena. The Western imperialist countries were still hesitating as to whether or not to bet on Hitler. As in the past, at the start of 1933 the ruling circles in Washington, London and Paris were not confident as to the readiness of the German fascists to become the striking force of the capitalist world in the struggle against the Soviet Union. Germany did not as yet have a large army for the creation of which both Hitler and the Reichswehr needed time. The Reich's economy, with its 6 million unemployed, was in the clutches of a severe

crisis. Hitler had to justify the faith of international imperialism and prove his ability to deal with the labor movement and the communists.

The plan of the Nazi leaders, the purpose of which was to establish their firm domination, was typical of the Hitlerite adventurists. They decided to organize a provocation of unparalleled scale, which could overwhelm the public both in Germany and abroad and accuse the communists so that immediately afterwards they could launch a mass terror. The plan was sharply to change the situation in the country in their favor unexpectedly, in one fell swoop.

The mentally unstable Dutchman Van der Lubbe fell in the fascist trap as the tool to be used by the Nazis and was obviously unaware of his fate. According to the Nazi plan, he was to burn down the Reichstag. It subsequently became clear that as early as April 1931 Van der Lubbe had been accidentally recruited on the street by one Georg Bell. This fascist was an agent of the "International League of the Struggle Against the Third International" in Geneva, and the trusted man of the head of its Munich branch, the Kaiser's General Hoffman.

Bell kept in touch with Van der Lubbe for almost 2 years and even took him to Munich, where he met noted Nazis, including Rosenberg and Roemm, the head of the storm troopers. In mid-February 1933, in Berlin, once again Van der Lubbe got in touch with the Nazis and agreed to assume the guilt for the planned fire at the Reichstag. All of this was blabbed out by Bell himself. One month later, he was killed on Austrian territory not far from the German border.

It was established that the fire was started by a group of select Hitlerite throat-cutters commanded by Heines (who was subsequently also liquidated by the Nazis themselves) and by Ernst. Together with Van der Lubbe they entered the Reichstag through an underground passage from the neighboring palace which belonged to Goring, at that time the Reichstag's president. When they withdrew from the building they left behind Van der Lubbe as a "communist arsonist."

The same night the order of mass arrests of communist activists was issued. The Nazi police used already drawn up lists of individuals to be detained. After the war, at the Nuremberg trial, Goring confirmed that the lists had been drafted 1 year earlier. G. Dimitrov was detained 10 days after the fire. The Hitlerites had no doubt that, using Gestapo "tactics," they would force him to act at the trial as a repentant "terrorist" and "an agent sent by Moscow."

A state of emergency was imposed in Germany. The communist party was accused of a conspiracy to seize the power, which was to be signaled by setting the Reichstag on fire. It was announced that the authorities had in their possession a number of documents proving the existence of a conspiracy and the communist intention of launching a "Red terror" in the country.

Typically, no "documents" were published after the fire, for they simply did not exist. On September of that same year, 1933, however, A. Ert, a White

Guard of German origin, a person close to Goebbels, published a book entitled "Armed Uprising," on the jacket of which the Reichstag in flames was depicted. During the trial, when Dimitrov asked that Ert be summoned as a witness, he was refused. The Hitlerites kept their man aside, perfectly aware of the fact that Dimitrov could easily expose him.

Ert's pasquil claimed that the burning of the Reichstag was to be followed by the assassination of Hitler and Goring by the communists and that the fire of a global revolution would spread from Germany to other Western countries. It was alleged that the Comintern and Soviet establishments in Germany were involved in preparations for this "operation." This was the basis for the author's statement that "Germany advanced in the struggle against the world enemy and thus assumed a mission which it will not abandon until carried out. Let the other nations...follow the German example. The destruction of the communist international is the task of nations throughout the entire Christian and civilized world." The day the book was published, FOLKISCHER BEOBACHTER, the Nazi Party organ, published an enthusiastic announcement on its front page under the long heading "Proof!... At the Last Minute Hitler's Government Saved Germany and Europe From a World Conflagration." This was an open appeal to the physical destruction of the communists not only in Germany but throughout the world.

In other words, the trial of Dimitrov had been planned by the then-"hawks" as a prologue to a global anticommunist and anti-Soviet aggression. It is difficult not to draw a parallel between all this hysterical propaganda, which was promoted by global reaction 50 years ago, and what our contemporaries keep hearing from overseas. Are these not precisely the same declarations about the communist "focus of evil" and appeals for a "crusade" against Marxism-Leninism that Washington is coming out with today? The similar and, occasionally, even the verbal coincidence, is striking. Also coinciding are the ideological direction and tonality of anticommunist propaganda and the desire to blame the communists for all misfortunes and upheavals in the world, presenting them in the role of organizers of terrorist activities engaged in "export of the revolution" and others.

During the Leipzig trial, naturally, Dimitrov could not as yet be familiar with the entire complexity of the Nazi conspiracy related to the burning of the Reichstag. However, he could clearly see and understand the main fact: the fascists had not targeted him personally. The target of the provocation were the Comintern and the Soviet Union. That is why, although in chains and threatened with death at any moment, without losing a single hour, Dimitrov undertook preparations for his counterattack.

Leipzig, 23 September 1933, 9 am. The hall of the Reich's Supreme Court. Dimitrov and his compatriots V. Tanev and B. Popov were considered lost from the very beginning. Who could save them? The newspaper correspondents, who were crowding the hall, representing virtually the entire world press, differed only on their assessment of the duration of the trial. The situation immediately changed when Dimitrov took the stand, however. It became clear who the real power was in the court and who would actually direct the course of the examination.

Dimitrov's testimony was not a defense but an accusation. The public was overwhelmed. It was as though Dimitrov was pointing at each one of the Nazi criminals. The procedure they had intended to follow in the trial broke down. This enraged the Hitlerites. The president of the court interrupted Dimitrov, shouting:

"Here you stand not as the accuser but the accused!"

Coolly, Dimitrov continued to ask direct questions aimed at exposing the fascist crime. Once again the president interrupted:

"Listen, you have no right to interfere in the course of the trial. You are acting as though you were directly involved in conducting the trial. Your question is not accepted."

Once again this had no effect. It was as though Dimitrov was not listening to the judge and continued to ask the same questions.

The president and the prosecutor were confused. To remove Dimitrov from the hall meant to cause an international scandal, for the entire world was following the course of the trial. In any case, everyone would clearly see who was trying to conceal the traces. The police were ordered to force Dimitrov to retake his seat.

In reporting Dimitrov's constant clashes with the president of the court, the correspondent of TELEGRAPH, the bourgeois Dutch newspaper, wrote: "Dimitrov was considerably superior to that old gentleman in terms of cleverness and skill. He constantly made him leave his place and yell at him, after which the president was unable to find his way back." Subsequently, that same correspondent noted that "Dimitrov has indeed taken over the proceedings of the trial."

The trial went on. Openly, the accused was engaging in what the Nazi press described as "communist propaganda." On 15 November he told the president: "If you want to lose some weight come to Moabit" (the Berlin jail where Dimitrov had been imprisoned for the trial). The public laughed. "You are somewhat nervous today, Mr President," Dimitrov remarked on a different occasion.

Rising from the bench of the accused, he read to the fascist court lines from the "Communist Party Manifesto" by K. Marx and F. Engels. When ordinary German communists were introduced in the hall as witnesses, Dimitrov cheered them up and inspired them with his daring questions and, despite pressure and threats of charges, their testimony helped to expose the fascist provocation. Whenever Dimitrov would mention the Soviet Union, he would proudly speak of his closeness to the first socialist country in the world. The public in the hall was amazed: Dimitrov was threatened with a death sentence and it was entirely likely that savage torture awaited him. However, he was calm and firm and showed not even the slightest hesitation or sign of fear.

While the court was interrogating Ruppin, a Reichstag deputy and fascist "witness," Dimitrov asked him:

"Are you perhaps ashamed of admitting that you are a Nazi?"

This was said on the territory of the Nazi state! The president shouted:

"I have no more patience! I warn you for the last time!"

Dimitrov answered:

"This is a political trial. I am neither a recruit nor a prisoner. I am using political arguments in defending myself against a political accusation."

On the day the trial was moved to Berlin, Goring appeared in the hall, the No. 1 man in Germany after Hitler and supreme commander of the Prussian police, the person who had actually organized the burning of the Reichstag.

Goring was confident that he would deal with Dimitrov quickly. What subsequently took place has been recorded forever in the history of the struggle against fascism. It was not Goring who confused Dimitrov, rather it was Dimitrov who actually interrogated Goring to the point that the latter almost had a fit.

Shaking his fist, Goring shouted at Dimitrov:

"Your party is a party of criminals who must be destroyed!... You must simply be hanged!"

"I am quite pleased with the answer of the prime minister," calmly answered Dimitrov and he showed his intention to continue with Goring's interrogation. The president ordered him to remain silent. Enraged and having totally lost all self-control, Goring shouted: "Out!"

On his order the police led Dimitrov out of the courtroom. However, he was not finished yet; he had to finish the fascist. As he was leaving, Dimitrov turned to Goring:

"Mr Prime Minister, you must fear my questions?"

It seemed to the public that Goring was about to have a heart attack. Trembling, he shouted after Dimitrov:

"Watch out, I will take care of you the moment you leave the courtroom!"

Unquestionably, a terrible reprisal was indeed being prepared those days. Not only Goring but all Nazi leaders were furious. A rightless communist, deprived of his freedom, had given a political slap in the face to the second most important person in the Reich before the eyes of the entire world. Goring had exposed himself by blabbing out the methods of "work" used by his department.

Several days later there was a new sensation. It was clear that the fascists had realized that Dimitrov, tortured in jail, would be even more dangerous to them than alive in his cell and that Hitler himself would be brought to shame.

Clearly, the order not to touch Dimitrov was issued precisely by Hitler, despite Goring's threat; no one else in the Reich would have dared to do so. Hitler and his retinue knew that the entire world was talking about the duel in the courtroom, openly laughing at Goring and admiring the moral strength and firmness of the Bulgarian communist. Berlin was unwilling to have the noise around his trial increase. In 1933 it was still looking at what was happening abroad.

On 16 December 1933 Dimitrov did address the court with the final speech granted to the accused. Following are his words:

"I admit that my language is sharp and stern. My life and struggle have always been sharp and stern. My language, however, is open and sincere....

"I defend myself as an accused communist.

"I am defending my own communist revolutionary honor.

"I am defending my ideas, my communist convictions.

"I am defending the purpose and meaning of my life.

"That is why every single word I have said in the courtroom is, so to say, blood from my blood and flesh from my flesh."

Such words cannot be forgotten.

He went on to say:

"My purpose was to refute the accusation that Dimitrov, Torgler, Popov and Tanev, the Communist Party of Germany and the Communist International had anything to do with the fire.... I wanted to prove that the communist party did not and does not have anything in common with any participation in such a crime."

G. Dimitrov not only brilliantly refuted the false accusation fabricated by the fascists but, using the opportunity granted to him, showed the entire world how to defend the Comintern line, how to propagandize its ideas and politics. He called for unity among the antifascist forces on earth.

Dimitrov ended as follows:

"We, communists, must today say no as firmly as the old Galileo:

"It is still turning!

"The reel of history is turning forward...

"This wheel, moved by the proletariat under the leadership of the Communist International, will not be stopped by destructive measures, hard labor or death penalties. It is turning and will continue to turn until the final victory of communism!"

After the trial was over, a convinced Nazi and former front-line veteran visited Dimitrov in his cell and told the Bulgarian communist the following:

"I am your enemy and will remain such but I must tell you frankly that I shall never forget your behavior in court. I fought the war but do not remember such firmness. I am your political opponent but I respect you as a person."

Dimitrov's political and moral strength confused even the dyed-in-the-wool enemies of communism.

It was this strength that forced the Nazis to retreat, to acknowledge defeat. The imperial court in Leipzig was quietly instructed to acquit Dimitrov, his two Bulgarian comrades and Torgler "for insufficient evidence." The death sentence was passed only on the semi-insane Dutchman Van der Lubbe, who was a helpless tool of the Gestapo.

Despite the acquittal, however, the fascists continued to keep Dimitrov in jail, transferring him to the underground cells of the Berlin Gestapo jail, isolated from the outside world. Although in the course of the investigation and the trial his state of health had become seriously undermined, he was refused even elementary medical help. Dimitrov's numerous appeals to the German judicial authorities demanding his immediate release were ignored.

Meanwhile, a wave of indignation was welling up in the world caused by Dimitrov's new imprisonment, although his innocence had been acknowledged even by a fascist German court. The campaign of solidarity with Dimitrov and his comrades developed from the very first days of their detention and continued to increase. On 15 February 1934 the government of the USSR resolved to grant G. Dimitrov Soviet citizenship and, at the same time, to demand his immediate release. On 27 February the Gestapo delivered him to the airport secretly and put him on a plane to Moscow.

Even then, after the most severe trials were behind him, Dimitrov did not put down his arms. Turning to Diels, the chief of Goring's police, who was accompanying him, he said:

"Give the German people my warmest regards and your government my greatest contempt.... I pity the industrious and talented German people. Through its policy and, particularly, its hostile attitude toward the USSR, your government is leading the people into a new catastrophe."

Dimitrov predicted what would occur with the "thousand-year" Third Reich. At the very border he told another fascist, Police Commissioner Geller:

"... I hope to return to Germany but as a guest of the German worker and peasant government!"

"Not as long as I live," the other responded nastily.

"Who can say how long that will be?"

Several hours later, Dimitrov was in Moscow in the arms of his Soviet brothers.

The trial of the burning of the Reichstag was not only a tremendous personal victory for Georgi Dimitrov. It was a victory for the Communist International and the entire international worker and antifascist movements. It was won to a tremendous extent thanks to the courage, fearlessness and political far-sightedness of the outstanding Bulgarian revolutionary.

Something is worth mentioning in this connection. Reichstag Deputy Torgler, who was still a member of the Communist Party of Germany but was subsequently expelled, and who had been charged along with Dimitrov, assumed the exactly opposite stand at the trial. This meek-natured and fearful although talented person, who had never risen to the level of a true revolutionary, let himself be frightened by the Nazis and refused to follow Dimitrov in his aggressive antifascist struggle and trial. Abandoning all efforts at willpower, all he tried was to prove his personal innocence. Torgler was acquitted alongside Dimitrov but his fate took a different turn. Trapped by the Nazis, he was never able to set himself free. During World War II Torgler served Goebbels within the fascist propaganda apparatus. After the war, crossing the Elbe River, he vanished entirely from the political horizon.

Under adverse circumstances, revolutionary fearlessness may cost a hero his life. However, this alone leads to victory. Cowardice and moral and political helplessness sooner or later kill anyone who has joined the revolutionaries but is unable to live like them.

The question is: Was Dimitrov's behavior at the Leipzig trial, as is frequently the case, merely the result of a particular, a purely emotional uplift triggered exclusively by the circumstances? It was not. He acted according to a plan which had been coolly thought out in jail while the investigation was still under way. Dimitrov read and wrote some 12 hours a day. His hands were held in chains which were not removed night or day. He studied works on philosophy, history, and literature and mastered German jurisprudence. When he felt tired he sang. Here is an excerpt from a letter he wrote at that time:

"...Naturally, personally things are not easy for me. I frequently feel like a caged bird with wings which it cannot use.... Sometimes, when I feel particularly bad, I quietly recite Goethe's famous poem:

Cowardly thoughts
Timid hesitations
Indecision
Fearful complaints
Will not remove misfortune
Or liberate you.
Despite all hostile forces
Endure, never bend
Hold on strong--
And the gods will be with you.

"I particularly like Goethe's superb aphorism:

If you lose money you do not lose too much,
If you lose honor a great deal,
If you lose courage you lose everything!

"Yes, daring, daring, always daring! Full steam ahead, regardless!"

Such precisely was his battle plan. It was not a spontaneous emotional uplift but a specific strategic deployment, the resolution to withstand at all cost and to win regardless of obstacles. That is what motivated Dimitrov during the trial. Awareness of inner strength, concentration of willpower, unshakeable ideological convictions and a feeling of unity with the fellow fighters were his reward. That is how people of his caliber live. This takes tremendous effort but the soul of such people never grows old and love for life never leaves them. That is why Dimitrov could sing in his cell, aware of the threat of death.

Naturally, it was not merely a question of fearlessness. Courage should never develop into blind thoughtlessness. This is even more dangerous in politics than in private life. Dimitrov knew when to attack, when to wait and when not to waste his efforts. Before mounting the attack he carefully checked the ratio of forces, studied the nature of the enemy and selected his positions. His daring was combined with strategic thinking, ability for theoretical analysis, knowledge of the matter and the people and extensive erudition.

The Leipzig trial indeed became a brilliant victory for Dimitrov. The correspondents' reports on his speeches and repartees in the court were heard and read by literally the entire world. Goring and his accomplices were not only exposed but publicly shamed. A single person--a detained Bulgarian communist--defeated the entire fascist Reich and the Hitlerites were forced to free him. The working people of different countries never forgot this. The author of these lines had the opportunity to listen on numerous occasions, during the subsequent years of the struggle against Hitlerism, that the anti-fascists, remembering Dimitrov, engaged in heroic exploits. Many resistance fighters, who began their unparalleled battle against fascism in the 1940s, remembered the character of Dimitrov. He was a worthy example of how to struggle without surrendering and how to win over people who appeared far stronger.

Dimitrov was not alone in his battle against fascism. Throughout the world, wherever there were communists and like-minded people in the international labor movement, one could feel the spontaneous growth of antifascism. At that time there was no city in the Soviet Union where meetings of protest against the Hitlerite provocation were not held. The entire population of the first socialist state in the world was in the throes of unrestrained anger against fascism and fraternal pride in Georgi Dimitrov. Unquestionably, this largely influenced the decision of the Nazi government to release Dimitrov.

Dimitrov's trial made an equally strong impression on the broad Western circles, the intelligentsia in particular. Following the creation of the "International Committee for Aid to Victims of Fascism," it was joined by outstanding men of world science and culture such as the writers Romain Rolland, Henri Barbusse and many others. Albert Einstein became its honorary chairman. The lawyer Morot-Giafferi, one of Dimitrov's lawyers, exclaimed at a mass meeting in Paris: "Goring, you are the arsonist!"

One week prior to the start of the Leipzig trial, a "countertrial" organized by the International Antifascist Committee opened in London on 14 September 1933. Top lawyers from a number of Western countries who, thanks to their experience and competence, enjoyed a higher reputation, participated in the investigation of the Nazi provocation. The famous London solicitor and royal counsel D. Britt was elected president. Sitting with him were the Swedish social democrat G. Branting, the aforementioned Paris lawyer Morot-Giafferi, and others. In hearing or reading of the testimony of the witnesses at the "countertrial," even people usually indifferent to politics became deeply touched and their indignation at the Hitlerite crime grew with every passing day.

At that time many people in the West realized for the first time what Nazism really was. Angry protests and calls for retribution were heard from all sides and not only among the workers. The right wing had simply nothing to say. The conservative political leaders as well kept silent. This was Hitler's first serious defeat ever since his ascension to power and the consequences of this defeat were felt for quite some time. A powerful demonstration of international solidarity of working people and democratic forces was taking place and the Hitlerites could not but feel this.

Today the worldwide antiwar movement directed against American imperialism and its NATO allies is an example of that same strong solidarity. Life itself once again imperatively dictates the need for unity among the entire peace-loving public. In concealing the hegemonistic and imperialist ambitions the right-wing U.S. circles and their desire to achieve military superiority over the USSR and to change the course of history, Reagan and his retinue are resorting to the same type of hackneyed methods of anticommunist propaganda that Dimitrov exposed to the entire world 50 years ago. Using, in particular, an incident involving the South Korean spy plane, thoroughly planned by the CIA, they are trying once again to accuse the communists of "international terrorism" and, under cover of such slanderous attacks, to engage in piratical actions, one after another, against independent and sovereign nations. The Soviet Union has always rebuffed such provocations and displayed fraternal solidarity with the victims of aggression and persecution on the part of international reaction and the forces of fascism and militarism.

Today these same forces are once again following the same path, with their eyes closed. Nor has fascism disappeared from the life of West Germany. As during Dimitrov's time, today it is relying on those same aggressive and militaristic circles of overseas imperialists blinded by class hatred of communism.

The forms are changing and the methods of imperialist provocations aimed at compromising and defaming in the eyes of the people the foreign and domestic policy of the Soviet Union and the noble objectives of the struggle waged by the world communist movement are improving and becoming technically increasingly refined. However, the nature of these provocations remains unchanged. To this day we can see in each one of them reflections from the fire of the Reichstag of 50 years ago and the echoes of the Leipzig trial concocted by the fascists.

As a rule, the fruits harvested by the organizers of such provocations and falsifications are the same as those of 50 years ago: the arsonists, the imperialists and their accomplices, and the organizers of hysterical anti-Soviet and anticommunist propaganda campaigns find themselves on the bench of the accused. Sooner or later secrets come out into the open and the truth emerges.

The plans of international reaction are doomed to failure. What gives us hope is the fact that an intensive struggle for peace and social progress, unparalleled in scope and strength, is developing throughout the world. Marching in its ranks are many people who have taken Georgi Dimitrov as their model. He has not been and never will be forgotten. He is an invisible but active participant in the great battle for the triumph of the cause of peace and communism.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/6

USSR IN THE VANGUARD OF THE STRUGGLE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 83 (signed to press 13 Dec 83) pp 78-88

[Article by Yu. Laporov]

[Text] It was 30 years ago, on 10 December 1948, that the UN General Assembly adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Ever since then, the date 10 December has been celebrated annually the world over as Human Rights Day.

The problems related to human rights, in the center of which is the comparison between the two sociopolitical systems, two ways of life and two directions in world politics, are on the front end of the current stage in the ideological confrontation between socialism and capitalism.

It is no secret that the forces of imperialism, which consider the ideological struggle a means for waging psychological warfare against the socialist countries and the liberated states, are cynically exploiting the topic of human rights in order to spoil the international climate and block the solution of the most vital problems of today--the problems of peace and security.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, engaged as it is in a decisive and uncompromising ideological struggle against imperialism, which includes the problem of human rights, it has always separated in its policies ideological problems from problems of intergovernmental relations. This approach is dictated by the awareness of its responsibility for the cause of peace. It is a guarantee for the development of normal relations between countries separated by irreconcilable ideological positions.

In the world of today, however, some problems of human rights occupy a noticeable place in international politics. It is a question, above all, of the type of violations of human rights which must be fought in order to safeguard international peace and security, and situations in which gross and mass violations of human rights are directly related to the threat to the peace, freedom and independence of the nations. It is obvious that international society cannot remain indifferent to the obvious violations of human rights by the racist regimes in South Africa or the crimes of the Israeli aggressor or else the suffering of the people of El Salvador and that in all such cases efficient measures are mandatory. The Soviet Union has always systematically favored this approach.

Unquestionably, we can only be very greatly concerned with the growth of the nuclear threat--a threat to the existence of the right to life, and, therefore, to all human rights. That is precisely why the question of safeguarding peace is at the bottom of the problems of human rights in all its ideological and political aspects, the more so since the course toward preparations for war, currently pursued by the most reactionary imperialist forces, inevitably leads to a frontal attack on human rights. The rights of the working people, already curtailed under the conditions of formal bourgeois democracy, are becoming sharply restricted. The acceleration of military preparations is accompanied by increased militaristic psychosis which triggers hatred, fear, and violence and creates conditions for the rebirth of fascism and a wild outburst of racism. Laws are being passed allowing the reactionary forces to mount a broad offensive on civil and political rights and freedoms. The practice of arbitrary behavior by the repressive apparatus is being legislatively strengthened. Freedom of political activities is being curtailed. The inviolability of the person is being virtually reduced to naught. The system of police supervision of the thoughts and actions of citizens is being strengthened and so is the persecution of the supporters of peace. War preparations are not only hindering social progress but triggering a trend toward social regress, making bourgeois democracy even more antipeople and antihumane, directly leading to the curtailment of basic socioeconomic rights and expenditures for social requirements and to increased unemployment. All of this has already become a fact of life in American society and a reality in a number of other countries which are following Washington's aggressive course.

Finally, under the conditions of preparations for a global war, the imperialist forces are increasingly resorting to the "local" use of force and to interfering in the domestic affairs of countries and peoples with a view to preserving or restoring their domination over the peoples of different countries, i.e., engaging in the most coarse and cruel suppression of human rights.

Therefore, the question of preserving the peace, restraining the arms race and establishing relations of cooperation among countries is a matter of actually securing the entire set of human rights.

Concern for peace is the linchpin of the policy pursued by our party and Soviet state. In standing up in defense of the rights of nations and for national independence and social progress under the conditions of a lasting peace, the Soviet Union is striving to assert an international order which would contribute to the expansion, intensification and multiplication of freedoms and improving the situation of the individual the world over. Such is the manifestation of the lofty humanistic mission of socialism--the flag bearer of human rights.

To Washington's "crusaders," who have set themselves the illusory objective of "democratizing" the entire world to a level of total imperialist domination, discussions related to human rights are a distracting maneuver, a smokescreen behind which military preparations are being intensified, limited, fast and protracted nuclear wars are planned, entire parts of the world

are proclaimed areas of American "vital interests," and blood-spilling puppet regimes are set up and kept in power.

In promoting a demagogic campaign on the topic of human rights, the imperialist leadership was motivated above all by its fear of the successes achieved by the USSR and the other members of the socialist commonwealth in peaceful construction and the growth of their influence in world affairs, as well as fears of the victories won by the national liberation movement and the advance of the revolutionary process as a whole.

The human rights campaign, which was initiated by former U.S. president Carter and his retinue, essentially, as planned by its inspirers, serves mainly the purpose of weakening socialism and becoming a means for subverting peaceful coexistence among countries with different sociopolitical systems, eroding detente and promoting psychological warfare against anything that is progressive in the world.

In terms of the liberated countries, the preaching of "defense of human rights," was considered one of the most refined instruments of neocolonialism. This campaign also had a clear internal aspect: the American leaders hoped that such a policy would help to restore the justifiably undermined faith of the Americans in their ruling circles.

Under the current American administration the imperialist nature of the U.S. line in the field of human rights intensified even further. For example, it was "enriched" by the so-called differentiated approach to "authoritarian" and "totalitarian" regimes. This was an even clearer manifestation of the shrieking antidemocratic, anti-Soviet and antisocialist line of this entire campaign.

Furthermore, in order to conceal its extreme reactionary foreign and domestic political course, the Reagan administration proclaimed a campaign of struggle against "international terrorism," the purpose of which was to substantiate the increasingly active and shameless support by the United States of the racists in South Africa, the Israeli aggressor and the military repressive machines in Latin America while, on the other hand, to discredit the national liberation and revolutionary movements, defame the foreign policy course of the USSR aimed at supporting the forces of social progress and presenting the Soviet Union and socialism as a whole as a destabilizing force and threat to peace.

However, this coarsely formulated campaign disturbed somewhat even the U.S. allies and brought to light some political differences between them and the United States on problems such as the reasons for the appearance and the means to resolve the problems in Central America. Its stupidity was too obvious and the true aspect of American imperialism was revealed all too clearly. For the sake of its own interest it was prepared to impose upon the nations and keep in power any kind of regime, even a most tyrannical one. The campaign against "international terrorism" not only failed to justify the hopes of the Reagan administration but caused it direct political damage.

Nevertheless, the campaign of struggle against "international terrorism" became one of the structural components of the "crusade against communism" proclaimed by President Reagan, a campaign launched against anyone rejecting Washington's diktat and arbitrariness. The very proclamation in our time of the medieval idea of a "crusade" is a mockery of universally accepted principles and norms of contemporary international law. It confirms the loss in the American leadership of a sense of reality and its claim for total permissibility.

The distortion of the problems of human rights in their different variations remains one of the main directions in Washington's political propaganda activities, for the slander of any "suppression" of human rights under socialism serves the ruinous policy of physical preparations for war. The two lies--the lie of the "Soviet military threat" and the "inhuman" nature of socialism, supplementing each other, create the type of background on which, as the White House assumes, it becomes easier somehow to justify this policy. "The preparations for war of the Washington administration are paralleled by a frenzied anti-Soviet hysteria," pointed out Marshal of the Soviet Union D. F. Ustinov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR minister of defense. "Ignoring all decency, highly placed U.S. officials slander the USSR, its people and policy and the socialist way of life. Lies, disinformation, misrepresentation of facts and provocations are used.. Such a policy pursued by the leaders in the White House is not simple emotion or rhetoric. It is a consciously planned and coolly and deliberately implemented long-term strategy aimed at broadening the confrontation and, therefore, increasing the threat of war."

However, all attempts at exploiting the topic of human rights to the benefit of imperialism were clearly doomed to failure. The more hypocritical were the oaths of loyalty to the ideals of human rights, freedom and morality, coming from the other side of the ocean, the more obvious became the gap between the words and actions of their self-appointed defenders, for the inevitable fact was that it was precisely by the fault of Washington's promoters of the ideals of human rights and freedoms that blood continued to be shed in the Middle East. Another ineradicable spot on the United States is also its involvement in the crimes of apartheid in the south of the African continent, for it was precisely as coparticipation in such a crime that the UN resolutions qualify political, economic and military cooperation with the South African republic, a country for which President Reagan has publicly proclaimed a feeling of sympathy. The service record of the overseas "defenders" of human rights also includes attempts "to bomb back to the Stone Age" Vietnam and to impose by force their order in Indochina. Lying on the conscience of these supporters of "free elections" are the overthrow of the constitutionally elected popular unity government by the people of Chile and replacing it with a fascist clique. Today, accompanied by outpourings in favor of elections and democracy, Washington is using the Somoza bandits in an effort to suppress the Nicaraguan revolution and the Danshaks in preventing the building of a new life by the people of Afghanistan; it is swearing "progress" in the field of human rights in blood-soaked El Salvador. And what could be more cynical and hypocritical than the use of the slogan of human rights in covering open-armed aggression committed against the peace-loving people of Grenada--a small country threatening no one?

Everyone realizes today that to Washington freedom, democracy and human rights end wherever the people break the chains of imperialist exploitation and take the path of truly independent development.

In its attempts to mislead public opinion, imperialist propaganda either ignores or deliberately distorts the position of the problem of human rights in international relations from the viewpoint of international law and the objective of international cooperation in the field of human rights and the manner in which the very idea of such cooperation developed. This is certainly no accident, for the international codification of the principle of respecting human rights is one of the manifestations of the progressive impact of socialism on global developments. It was precisely the Great October Socialist Revolution which proclaimed the truly democratic principles which met with the broadest possible response among the peoples of the world. It was precisely in the example set by the Soviet state that the working people in other countries saw the meaning of such rights and freedoms in action and that the observance of the rights of the individual is inseparably related to respect for the rights of nations, the elimination of all forms of foreign oppression and domination and the establishment of peaceful and equal relations among peoples. The USSR made an immeasurable contribution to the defense of human rights through its decisive role in the victory over fascism. This contribution was manifested also in the fact that the demand of the peoples to restore human rights and freedoms trampled by fascism was codified in the UN charter.

Although Western politicians and ideologues do not like to recall this, it was precisely on the initiative of the Soviet Union that the UN Charter included the stipulation of the resolve of nations "to reassert their faith in basic human rights, the dignity and value of the individual, the equality between men and women and the equal rights of big and small nations," to "contribute to social progress and to improve living conditions under greater freedom," and the stipulation of the development of friendly relations among nations both on the basis of respect for the principles of equality and self-determination of nations." It was precisely thanks to the Soviet Union that cooperation "in encouraging and developing respect for human rights and basic freedoms for all, regardless of race, sex, language and religion" is one of the basic objectives of the United Nations.

No other approach on the part of our country was possible in the formulation of the charter. As A. A. Gromyko, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs, emphasized, "Since the days of Lenin this demand protecting the rights of nations and the rights of man has been an inseparable part of Soviet foreign policy."

The United Nations Charter was drafted as a document aimed at developing a system of international relations which would exclude the possibility of the outbreak of a new war, a kind of charter for peaceful coexistence. That is why all of its stipulations, including those related to human rights, obey the main objective of the UN--maintaining international peace and security and developing friendly relations among nations. The charter also stipulates

that international cooperation in the field of human rights should be strictly consistent with all other principles codified in it, above all those of sovereign equality of countries and noninterference in their domestic affairs.

This is also supported by facts from the history of the establishment of the United Nations and its charter. Thus, the report submitted by one of the subcommittees at the San Francisco Conference, at which the UN charter was adopted, stipulated that securing and defending human rights and basic freedoms are the internal affair of the individual countries ("Documents of the UN International Conference in San Francisco, 1945," Vol VI, London-New York, 1945, p 705). In other words, the defense and protection of human rights are exclusively an area of domestic competence of the individual countries and are achieved through domestic measures.

This concept was universally acknowledged in international law and was reasserted at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Its Final Act directly stipulates that the participating countries will "respect the reciprocal right freely to choose and develop their political, social, economic and cultural systems, as well as their right to promulgate their own laws and administrative regulations." The obligations of the states to refrain from the "use or distortion of problems related to human rights as a means of interfering in internal affairs of the countries" is also mentioned in the "Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of Countries," adopted by the General Assembly in 1981.

The West is trying to ignore or distort all such stipulations, for the reason that the approach taken by the United States and its allies to problems of human rights is in sharp contradiction with the UN Charter and the Final Act of the European Conference and violates universally accepted norms of international relations.

Fully consistent with such norms and documents of the struggle against aggression, war and the threat of war and against genocide and the struggle against colonialism, racism and foreign domination and oppression is the struggle for human rights, which is at the leading end of this struggle and a primary task of the international cooperation in this area.¹

The Soviet Union, which has always been in the vanguard of this struggle, has always strived for international cooperation in the field of human rights to be focused precisely on such tasks. Specifically, the USSR initiated the adoption of the Declaration on Granting Independence to Colonial Countries and Nations of 1960, which is considered the world over a historical landmark in the decolonization process. As a result of the consistent efforts of the USSR the right of nations to self-determination was confirmed in a number of other UN General Assembly resolutions, including the 1970 Declaration on Principles of International Law, which deals with friendly relations and cooperation among countries in accordance with the UN Charter. The USSR has made persistent efforts to include the stipulation on the rights of nations to self-determination in international pacts on human rights, which has been accomplished despite the opposition of the Western countries.

Thanks to the efforts of the USSR and the other socialist and progressive developing countries, problems of the struggle against the gross and mass violations of human rights committed by imperialism are the backbone of the agenda of the main UN organs dealing with problems of human rights. The General Assembly, the Commission on Human Rights and other UN bodies have passed a number of important resolutions aimed at putting an end to such extreme violations. In a number of its resolutions the United Nations has condemned the regime in South Africa, which created the criminal apartheid system; it has exposed the involvement of the United States and other NATO countries in the crimes of the racists. The resolutions and discussions within the United Nations bodies expose the aggressive and expansionistic actions by Israel, confirm the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and condemn the United States' direct connivance with Israel. In the last session of the UN Commission on Human Rights, which took place in February-March 1983, the slaughter in the Sabra and Shatila refugee camps was qualified as an act of genocide, in which the responsibility of the Israeli authorities was established. For more than 9 years the question of the crimes of the military fascist junta in Chile has remained on the agenda of the UN bodies dealing with human rights. The resolutions passed by the United Nations in recent years have drawn the attention of the world's public on events in El Salvador and Guatemala, thus substantially contributing to the exposure of the U.S. policy of intervention in Central America. Furthermore, they contain a clear appeal to refrain from procurements of weapons and giving other military support to the juntas in El Salvador and Guatemala.

This shows that the ratio of forces in the agencies dealing with problems of human rights within the United Nations is clearly not favorable to the United States and its allies (let us parenthetically note that in its 28 February 1983 issue NEWSWEEK, the American weekly, published an article the essential topic of which was that the best solution for the West would be to abolish the UN Commission on Human Rights, for it was an agency in which the tone was set by socialist and developing countries, while the Western countries were on the defensive. At the 38th UN General Assembly Session, the United States, which describes itself as a "leader" in the defense of democracy and freedom, voted against virtually all submitted resolutions on human rights. The delegation of the Soviet Union supported all of them and they were adopted by the UN members by an overwhelming majority.

This is no isolated example. The negativistic approach to the work of the United Nations on human rights is generally characteristic of the United States. It is virtually impossible to find any substantial General Assembly resolution on problems of the struggle against racism and apartheid against which the United States has not voted. Furthermore, the United States did not even attend the Second World Conference on the Struggle Against Racism and Racial Discrimination, which was held in August 1983 by UN General Assembly decision (attended by some 130 countries).

One could most definitely say that no single country, with the exception of South Africa and Israel, has pitted itself against the international community on questions of human rights so challengingly as the United States. This is also confirmed by the position which it has held for many years on

the subject of the drafting and universal application of international legal acts stipulating specific obligations in the field of human rights.

The main among these documents are the International Pact on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Pact on Civil and Political Rights. Within the United Nations work on such documents has dragged on for nearly 20 years, mainly because of the obstructionist position assumed by the United States and some other Western countries which have deliberately protracted the work and emasculated the content of the most important articles in the drafts, particularly in terms of rights as those of peoples to self-determination and an entire set of socioeconomic rights. However, after a long and difficult struggle the pacts were adopted by the General Assembly and enacted in 1976.

In accordance with these pacts the governments undertake, in particular, to secure the exercise of the rights to work, to just and favorable working conditions, trade unions, social benefits, adequate living standards, health care, education, participation in cultural life and management of governmental affairs, freedom and inviolability of the person, free movement, including the right to leave a country, freedom of thought, conscience and religion, the right to hold personal opinions, peaceful assembly, freedom of association, and others. The pacts stipulate specific restrictions in the exercise of some of these rights.² Both pacts acknowledge the right of nations to self-determination. Like other agreements in the field of human rights, the pacts do not grant rights directly to individuals; they must be exercised by the state through the adoption of legislative and other domestic measures.

Both pacts stipulate procedures for consideration on the international level of problems related to the exercise of their stipulations by the participating countries. In accordance with the International Pact on Civil and Political Rights, a special organ was set up--the Committee for Human Rights. The reports submitted by countries participating in the International Pact on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights are reviewed by the UN Economic and Social Council.

The Soviet Union, which participated in the drafting of these pacts most actively, was the first of the permanent members of the UN Security Council to ratify them. It participates in all most important international-legal documents related to human rights, many of which were drafted on its initiative. They include the Convention on Preventing and Punishing Crimes of Genocide, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the International Convention on Eliminating and Punishing Crimes of Apartheid and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

The United States is not a signatory of even a single one of these accords. The propaganda show promoted by U.S. President Carter in 1977--his initialing of the pacts--had no aftermath whatsoever, for to this day the pacts have not been ratified by the American Congress. Clearly, they will share the fate of the Convention on Preventing the Crime of Genocide, the ratification of which

has been under consideration by the Senate since 1949. The unwillingness to assume specific obligations (and accordingly inform the international community on their implementation) is quite an eloquent proof of its real attitude toward human rights.

Although a number of agreements in this area were ratified by some Western countries, their participation included a number of rather important stipulations. Thus, for example, in ratifying the Pact on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Great Britain stated that it cannot ban all forms of discrimination and ensure the right of every citizen to a just wage and equal wages for equal labor as stipulated by the pact (UN Document ST/HR/4/Rev. 4, P-40).

In ratifying the International Pact on Civil and Political Rights, the Netherlands and several other Western countries refused to accept Point I of Article 20, which stipulates that "all war propaganda must be banned by law" (ibid., p 55).

Even human rights which the Western countries claim to recognize are not ensured under capitalist conditions either juridically or economically. This applies above all to vitally important rights as the right to work, housing, education, health care, and old-age benefits. Mass unemployment is the clearest and sternest confirmation of this fact. Naturally, it is not alone. Thus, according to the Associated Press, in the winter of 1982/1983 some 2 million Americans were thrown out on the street for their inability to pay their rent.

No less grave is the question of the violation of political and civil rights in the imperialist countries. Abuse of power, antilabor and antidemocratic legislation, racism, discrimination against national minorities, police repression and naked violence and cruelty displayed toward democratic forces reveal the antidemocratic nature of countries describing themselves as "bastions" of bourgeois democracy.

According to the well-known political personality A. Young, at one time permanent U.S. representative to the United Nations, today thousands of political prisoners are wasting away in U.S. jails.

Nor is the United States the exception. When in the course of debates in the British Parliament in March of 1983 M. Rifkind, parliamentary deputy minister of foreign affairs, demagogically commented on "'dissidents' in the Soviet Union," member of Parliament A. Lewis asked "whether the British government intended to release from jail 5,000 Britons who had been imprisoned for more than 2 years without trial." The answer of the foreign office representative was that this member of Parliament was rendering a "poor service" to his country. The DAILY MAIL, a conservative newspaper, noted in this connection that "it would be a horrible idea if the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs were to summon the British ambassador and demand the release of these 5,000 people" (DAILY MAIL, 10 March 1983).

In 1978 the Committee on Human Rights considered a Soviet report on the implementation of the International Pact on Civil and Political Rights in our

country. Some 200 questions were asked in the course of the discussions on this report, each one of which was exhaustively answered. Having considered the USSR report, the committee noted that "it is comprehensive and contains detailed information on legislation aimed at securing civil and political rights as stipulated by the pact" (Report of the Committee on Human Rights, United Nations, New York, 1978, p 90). In 1980 the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, which was set up in accordance with the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, received the report of the USSR on the implementation of the stipulations of this document. The committee's report formulated the results of the consideration of the Soviet report as follows: "The committee members gave a high rating to the outstanding proofs of the praiseworthy efforts made by the Soviet Union to implement its obligations based on the convention.... The view was expressed that the October Revolution inspired the peoples in their struggle for independence and that Lenin anticipated the convention by calling for taking special measures to resolve the national problem. It was also recalled that the Soviet Union had played a major role in the struggle against a specific form of racism, i.e., Nazism. It was also emphasized that the laws of the Soviet Union are based on internationalism, democracy and humanism" (Report of the Committee on Racial Discrimination. United Nations, New York, 1980, pp 123-124).

We believe that such assessments need no particular comment: we have nothing to hide and we have no reasons to avoid any discussion on human rights if they are serious and substantive. The very appearance of the new social system was related to the aspiration to make real the right to a worthy human existence, i.e., above all to lead a life without exploitation and to create conditions for the all-round development of the individual.

The very first legislative acts of the Soviet system--the Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia and the Declaration of the Rights of the Toiling and Exploited People--were aimed at the juridical codification of the freedom of the individual in the first socialist state. The Soviet state ensured for the working people "the type of actual possibility of exercising democratic rights and freedoms which had never existed, even in its approximation, in the best and most democratic bourgeois republics" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch" [Complete Collected Works], vol 37, p 499).

The new Soviet Constitution, which codified the broadest possible set of socioeconomic, political and individual rights and freedoms, which are fully exercised by and guaranteed to the citizens of the USSR, was a manifestation of true democracy and humanism. Such guarantees are ensured by the political and economic structure of the society, its socioclass structure, free from exploiting elements, true rule by the people, steady development and advancement of socialist democracy, and high spiritual culture. In this case the rights of the individual are steadily broadened and their real content is steadily rising to a higher level along with social progress.

The current stage in its development has been defined by the party as the stage of advancing developed socialism. "This is a society," pointed out Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, at the June 1983

CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "in which the economic base, social structure and political system consistent with socialist principles have been fully created, and where socialism is developing, to use the common expression, on its own collectivistic foundation." Such a society offers the broadest possible scope for the implementation of the great principle of collectivism and for the exercise of the collective rights and obligations of the working people which, as Comrade Yu. V. Andropov emphasized, "make the socialist system the mainspring of social progress."

The CPSU proceeds in its entire tireless and comprehensive efforts aimed at ensuring the full rights and freedoms of the Soviet people, from the programmatic slogan of "everything for man, everything for the good of man." This vast formula, Comrade A. A. Gromyko emphasized at the USSR Supreme Soviet session of 16 June 1983, "is also manifested in the objectives toward which our foreign policy is oriented." The position of the USSR and the other socialist states on problems of human rights and freedoms in the international arena is an extension of their domestic policies aimed at the development of socialist democracy and broadening the rights and freedoms of citizens.

As far as the United States and the other imperialist countries are concerned, clearly they have substantial reasons for avoiding any serious and specific discussion on human rights.

The United States and its allies are also avoiding a discussion on the main problem in the field of human rights--securing the right of life. At the Madrid meeting, for example, while demagogically accusing the socialist countries of violating human rights and trying to talk to them in the language of ultimatums, they interpreted the thesis of human rights as a "factor of peace" roughly as follows: unless the socialist countries guarantee human rights in the Western understanding of the term (i.e., as long as they prevent activities aimed at undermining the socialist system), there could be neither peace nor normal relations between capitalist and socialist countries; instead, there would be a concentrated arms race and concentrated preparations for nuclear war.

It is natural that it was precisely the Soviet Union which submitted within the United Nations the initiative of preventing a nuclear war and thus ensuring the right of man to life, an initiative which was actively supported by the developing countries. Initially the UN human rights commission and, subsequently, the UN General Assembly passed resolutions which openly state that "all nations and all people have the inalienable right to life and that securing this primary right is a necessary prerequisite for the implementation of the entire set of economic, social, cultural and civic and political rights."

When the resolution on the right to life was put to a vote at the latest 39th session of the UN Human Rights Commission, 11 of the 43 commission members voted against it. It was thus that the United States and other Western countries clearly revealed the hypocrisy of their approach to human rights.

Reality proves that imperialism will be unable to mislead world public opinion. This is also confirmed by the unparalleled scope of the antiwar movement in the capitalist world. "The broad social circles," Comrade A. A. Gromyko pointed out at the June USSR Supreme Soviet session, "spontaneously express in their antiwar actions the aspiration of the people to defend their right to life. Yes, precisely to defend their right to life. We know the way some countries are unconscientiously using the question of human rights, drowning it in demagoguery. Yet when it becomes a question of the real human rights, the right to life above all, they ignore them."

Guided by the letter and the spirit of the UN Charter, the Soviet Union is firmly and decisively standing in defense of human rights in the international arena. The voice of the Soviet representatives, who are exposing the imperialist practice of gross and mass violations of human rights, is convincingly heard also from the high rostrum of the United Nations and other prestigious international forums. The policy of the USSR, defined by the Peace Program for the 1980s, which was adopted at the 26th CPSU Congress, and the new foreign policy initiatives of the Soviet Union are systematically aimed at lifting the threat of nuclear war, strengthening peace and returning the course of world events to the stable track of defense and international cooperation. Their implementation would not only offer the necessary prerequisites for ensuring the prime right of every person--the right to life--but would contribute to the comprehensive implementation of one of the important objectives stipulated in the UN Charter--encouraging and developing respect for human rights and basic freedoms for all

FOOTNOTES

1. In 1978, on the initiative of the socialist and the developing countries, the UN General Assembly passed Resolution 32/130, which stipulates that in considering problems of human rights the UN must pay prime attention to the struggle against mass and gross violations of human rights "which are the result of apartheid and all forms of racial discrimination, colonialism, foreign domination, occupation, aggression and threat to national sovereignty, national unity and territorial integrity, and refusal to recognize the basic rights of nations to self-determination and the right of every nation to exercise full sovereignty over its riches and natural resources.
2. In 1953 the then-U.S. secretary of state, John Dulles, loudly proclaimed that the United States will never sign such documents. That same year this position was officially proclaimed by the U.S. member of the UN Human Rights Commission. This U.S. approach proved an unwillingness to acknowledge even the most basic democratic rights and freedoms. Essentially the United States has not changed its position. Thus, for example, at the autumn 1983 session of the UN Economic and Social Council the American delegation declared that the United States does not acknowledge the existence of human rights, such as the right to adequate nutrition and the right to the population's participation in resolving problems of governmental and social life, and voted (the only one to do so) against the respective draft resolutions.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

COMMUNIST PARTY OF GREECE STANDS FOR FUNDAMENTAL CHANGES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 83 (signed to press 13 Dec 83) pp 89-95

[Article by Grigoris Faracos, CP of Greece Central Committee Politburo member]

[Text] Last November the Communist Party of Greece celebrated the 60th anniversary of its founding. These have been years of severe struggle and tremendous sacrifices experienced together with and for the people.

Our party is "the oldest." In today's Greek reality it is the oldest of all parties. As was emphasized at the 11th CPG Congress (December 1982), "there have been many movements and parties (in Greece--the author), some of them large. However, their life proved to be short. The CPG meanwhile lives. Today it is the oldest and, at the same time, the youngest party." No other party in our country could be compared with the CPG, not only from the viewpoint of its consistency in the struggle for peace and democracy and social progress but also the continuity of its activities and its endurance under most adverse political circumstances and inflexibility in the face of the various types of social and national difficulties experienced by Greece over the past 65 years.

In the course of its history the CPG has never tolerated conservatism and anachronism or the deeply rooted dogmas which, to one extent or another, were adopted by the bourgeois political parties. The CPG has always tried to remain in the vanguard of the struggle waged by the most active forces of the nation in favor of social well-being and renovation in the political, economic, cultural and all other fields of social life and the life of the country at large. Every major or minor step taken by our people during those years has been one way or another closely related to the party's purposeful activities and concepts and its steady efforts aimed at their dissemination, propaganda and implementation and the tireless struggle waged by its members and supporters at the cost of tremendous efforts and, at certain periods, incalculable sacrifices, a struggle waged in all its forms against the forces of regression and reaction, a struggle which has already brought about many changes and, above all, opened new opportunities for decisive progress on the path to socialism.

When we state that our party is "the oldest," we also emphasize that today it is "the youngest." This is, above all, because it has operated legally for only 9 years after remaining in a state of clandestinity for 27 years, not to

mention a considerable number of other long and short periods during which it operated semilegally or illegally. Such periods are now in the past. Our party is young also because by virtue of the existing circumstances today most of its members and leading party workers are young. The 11th CPG Congress pointed out that 77 percent of the overall number of leading personnel are people under 40. The overwhelming majority of today's party members and activists were molded and acquired their political maturity during the last complex 15 years without breaking their ties with the previous generations within the revolutionary movement with their tremendous experience in the struggle and valuable traditions. Even during the new circumstances which developed in our country over the past 2 years, this enabled the CPG to offer accurate and scientific assessments of contemporary international and domestic political conditions and to indicate the trends of the struggle waged by our people for peace throughout the world and radical change in the country.

The right wing suffered a major defeat at the October 1981 parliamentary elections. As a result, PASOK came to power--a movement the programmatic declarations of which, although unclear, had a general anti-imperialist and antimonopoly trend. The CPG not only stood its ground in this "duel" against the biggest political forces and not only retained but even increased the number of votes cast for it. It was generally acknowledged that over the past 2 years it had considerably increased its influence. All of this, including the peculiarity of the circumstances and the events which had developed in our homeland, restored international interest in the "Greek paradox" and "Greek dissonance," which clashed with the fictitious unity of the West under the aggressive Reagan umbrella raised in the spirit of the cold war.

However, two real facts are at the bottom of the noise raised in the West or, rather, its serious concern.

First of all, we cannot ignore the fact that 2 years have already passed since the right wing was removed from power in the country, which it had held almost uninterruptedly throughout the postwar period, promoting despotism and servility.

Secondly, we must emphasize that in our country shifts began to be noted toward something opposite to the conciliationist policy of recent years. An end was put to the old tradition according to which Greece was always supposed obediently to say "yes" to imperialist orders. New trends began to appear in its foreign policy: our small country began to formulate peaceful initiatives. A certain shift toward democracy took place. A strong blow was dealt at official anticommunism and anti-Sovietism. The efforts at some kind of "modernization" in the activities of big capital triggered a corresponding reaction on its part and "dormant waters" began to stir.

All of this, although constituting a major step forward compared to the past, does not mean the development of an essentially new movement in the country toward national independence and economic development in the interest of the working people. As was noted at our party's 11th Congress, despite the existence of positive changes, the new situation remains "conflicting and complex." Thus, Greece remains a member of NATO, although of a rather peculiar

nature. After the recent conclusion of a new agreement, which was ratified by Parliament with the help of PASOK deputies and the right-wing New Democracy Party, the American bases will remain on our territory at least until 1990. Although the government has taken several halfway steps to control monopoly activities, it continues to swear loyalty to "private initiative."

Naturally, we realize that the path to progress is not a "walk down Nevskiy Prospekt." In life such difficult crossing passages, dangerous turns, and highs and lows are always present along this path. This is a truth fully confirmed by the events in Greece after October 1981. The balance between the competing forces cannot last long. Contradictions have not been eliminated and are awaiting their resolution. Imperialism, the local reaction and the oligarchy have mounted an offensive, resorting to threats, blackmail and economic pressure, in an effort to return Greece, the "black sheep," to the waters of blind Atlanticism and monopoly arbitrariness. They shy at nothing in this struggle relying both on support, above all by NATO and the EEC, and the military bases and its economic strength within the country. Today, now 2 years after the defeat of the right wing, our country finds itself on the verge of a decisive turn of the initiated but unfinished struggle.

Mankind is currently experiencing its most critical period since the end of the world war. The leading Western European NATO member countries, the American administration above all, are trying to surmount the crisis and regain the ground under their feet by resuming the cold war and displaying merciless aggressiveness in all parts of the globe and through an unrestrained arms race. No illusions should exist should Reagan's policy be fully implemented and if the new "holy alliance for cold war," which the U.S. administration is imposing on the West, particularly in Europe, were to have defeated: Along with the tremendous danger which threatens not only peace but the very life on earth, a reactionary wave may sweep off all democratic gains achieved by the peoples of many countries, including Greece.

This is particularly important to a country such as Greece, which is located in a rather tense part of the world and has always acted as a sensitive seismograph of imperialist aggressiveness. The aggravation of the international situation has repeatedly led our country, by virtue of its dependence on imperialism, to national upheavals and domestic anomalies and tragedies. Furthermore, the threat of their recurrence exists today as well, while the conflict between Greece and Turkey remains unresolved and the U.S. imperialists are encouraging the expansionistic plans of the chauvinists in Ankara concerning our country, and when the solution of the sensitive Cypriot problem is not only dragging on but worsening while the situation in the Middle East, close to us, is becoming increasingly explosive.

All of this is largely contributing to the development in our country of a broad anti-imperialist movement in the defense of peace, reflecting the feelings of the majority of the Greek people. The communists were and remain the heart and inspiration of this movement.

It is not a question of a movement of a temporary and circumstantial nature. This movement has deep roots in the recent history of our country and the

dramatic practical experience of the Greek people. Political unions and new groups were formed after the fall of the dictatorship in 1974 on the basis of its demands for a peaceful Greece without American bases and nuclear weapons. It played a decisive role in the defeat of the right wing in 1981. Today this is a major force which encourages and supports the government's desire to play a peaceful role. Let us frankly say, however, that this desire itself is not deprived of contradictions and major oscillations.

Significant events in this area took place in the country following the 1981 elections. From the very beginning of its activities, the government refused to approve the American and NATO plans aimed at deploying "Pershings" and cruise missiles in a number of Western European countries. It firmly separated itself from the antisocialist campaign against Poland, urged on from the outside, and did not participate in the economic and trade sanctions imposed on that country. Greece did not join the unyielding position of the Americans and most of their allies in the disarmament talks and had a positive attitude and welcomed the peaceful initiatives of the USSR and the Warsaw Pact members. In the Balkans the Greek government continues to develop a policy of cooperation with the socialist countries. It launched the currently discussed initiative of establishing a nuclear-free zone in the Balkans. Greece holds a peace-loving position on other matters as well affecting our area and the entire world. It supports the struggling Arab peoples. It has granted diplomatic recognition to the PLO as the only legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

Recent significant peace initiatives and actions on the part of the government include its suggestion to the EEC countries of a 6-month delay in the deployment of "Pershings" and cruise missiles, and the Greek veto at the EEC Council of Ministers of Foreign Affairs which defeated the joint resolution of condemning the Soviet Union in connection with the familiar incident involving the South Korean airplane.

However, even such displays of independence in foreign policy on the part of our country have triggered a strong counteraction on the part of the United States and conservative governments in Europe. Obviously, imperialism today is totally unwilling to tolerate any kind of "disobedience," for this would reduce its power in its confrontation with the socialist countries and hinder the further spiraling of the arms race and any aggression against peoples it considers displeasing.

The Reagan administration has long tried to tie our country to its policies through threats, blackmail and pressure. To this effect it systematically uses Ankara's expansionistic aspirations directed against Greece. Recently our sovereign rights over the island of Limnos were questioned within NATO for provocative purposes. This was an additional reason for Greece not to participate in NATO exercises. In the course of the exercises U.S. airplanes systematically and provocatively violated our country's air space. The Americans answered rudely and cynically the respective steps taken by Greece, saying that it was their right to do so, based on Greece's NATO membership!

The CPG fully approves any step leading to positive changes in Greek foreign policy. The Greek government, however, judging by its recent actions, is beginning to yield to the pressure, as confirmed by its reaction to the criminal U.S. invasion of Grenada, and expressing satisfaction with the American answer to violations of our national air space. The CPG firmly and systematically opposes imperialist provocations against our country. It tries to broaden as much as possible the front of the struggle waged by the Greek people aimed at repelling such provocation, implementing its peace initiatives and extending them to a wider range of most urgent contemporary problems.

We believe that as long as Greece remains a member of the EEC and NATO and retains American bases on its territory, its role as a peace-loving country will be shaky. It will always be dependent on conditions dictated by other members of these organizations, while our national independence will remain greatly restricted, for given the circumstances of our country imperialism benefits from powerful military, political and economic opportunities for engaging in blackmail, threats and interference in its domestic affairs.

Lifting the pressure exerted on us currently and strengthening and further developing Greece's peaceful foreign policy demand, above all, a reduction in the amount of imperialist interference, including the elimination of any support for imperialism within the country. This can be achieved only by at least withdrawing from the military NATO organization, closing down the U.S. bases on our territory and developing procedures for revoking EEC membership. This course which, incidentally, was consistent with the electoral declarations of the ruling party, would be supported by a powerful domestic front of the Greek people.

It was precisely on the basis of these considerations that we categorically opposed the agreement which the government recently signed on the American bases.

The existence of foreign military bases not only presents our country with an imminent threat of involvement in military adventures for the sake of interests alien to us and could not only paralyze the country's defense system at any moment, but also unleashes the hands of the American imperialists who thus hold a powerful additional instrument of pressure and blackmail toward Greece, thus predetermining its foreign policy and development of domestic political events.

No less contradictory and difficult is the internal situation, above all in the field of the economy and economic policy, for the economic crisis is creating particularly difficult circumstances for our country compared with the developed capitalist countries. This crisis proved the entire groundlessness of postwar developments pursued by the right-wing governments, entirely regulated by local and foreign big capital and merciless exploitation of human and natural resources. Today we are experiencing the consequences of such policy. The country's industrial base is weak (its technological base is very weak); in the past it was based on excessive exploitation and a variety of privileges which has today brought about its

further drastic worsening. Agriculture is splintered and its foundations are rotten. It needs radical change. By virtue of the dominating system of string-pulling and bribery and ties with monopoly capital, governmental institutions and the state economic sector are experiencing a deep crisis manifested in a hated bureaucratic system, inefficiency and major deficits in the balance of payments. Joining the EEC particularly contributed to such results.

The outcome of this situation is clearly visible in the country's basic economic indicators. The decline in industrial output has become chronic. Capitalist investments suffer from stagnation. We have been unable to eliminate inflation, which has remained on the 20 percent or even higher annual level over the past few years. The balance of payments deficit and the country's external debts are rising steadily while unemployment has become epidemic.

With a view to surmounting the crisis, for the past 2 years the government has been pursuing a totally erroneous economic policy. Instead of hitting monopoly arbitrariness, it has limited itself to half measures and, in a number of cases, has even compromised with the monopolies. It has resorted to one-sided cuts the entire burden of which has fallen on the working class and the blue-collar workers and to measures of despotism toward them, which have even led to curtailing their rights, such as the right to strike.

With full justification we can assume that such a policy would totally deprive the government of the broad support of the working people it needs. At the same time, however, it does not enjoy the trust of the economic oligarchy. Having become accustomed to total rule, superprofits and major fraud for decades, shielded by the political system or even acting together with it on an equal basis, and accustomed to the wasting of government funds, state support, innumerable privileges, tax benefits and generous loans, the oligarchy is intolerant of even the slightest new development on the part of the current government if it affects its interests. It is stubbornly opposing any attempt, even the most superficial, to control prices, limit loans and control enterprises heavily indebted to the state, the functioning of which has become problematic. Thus, for example, a number of recent events, such as the prosecution by the government of a group of officials of the Agat-Iraklis large cement enterprise for scandalous deals to the detriment of the national economy, involving tens of millions of dollars, and the government's proclaimed intention to introduce state control over some large enterprises owing huge amounts of money to the state, triggered a tempest of indignation and numerous attacks on the part of the large industrialists, who claim that "private initiative" is being persecuted.

We totally disagree with the government's economic policy. It is entirely clear to us that these and similar scandalous events and manifestations of illegality are not isolated phenomena but an embodiment of the system and mode of operation of the monopoly oligarchy.

For this reason, one of our appeals to the government is to wage a decisive struggle against the monopolies and convert its economic policy to an anti-monopoly base. Along with taking decisive steps to exercise control over and limit the activities of the monopolies and stop their arbitrary behavior and to abolish the tax benefits enjoyed by the monopoly oligarchy, a key problem in this direction is the radical improvement and democratization of the

state-economic sector and its expansion through further nationalization which, incidentally, was one of the electoral promises made by PASOK, so that an effective lever be created for pursuing an antimonopoly policy of efficient development for the good of the working people. This would enable the country to come out of the crisis.

The implementation of such a policy presumes further democratization in all fields of political and social life, the democratization of the trade union movement and the actual participation of the working people in decision-making, particularly in the state economic sector. Above all, however, such a policy presumes that the government relies on the support of the working people and their struggle, and on all progressive forces.

The government's aspiration toward independence in foreign policy, its peace initiatives and the even minor steps it has taken toward democratization and its efforts to introduce new developments in the economic area are meeting with the stubborn opposition of the New Democracy Party, which is a powerful lever in the hands of the Greek right wing. The New Democracy Party, which today entirely expresses the interests of imperialism the objectives of which it shares, has long abandoned any respect even for the conventions and has mounted a fierce and broad offensive against the government, essentially against the positive features of its policy.

In mounting its counteroffensive, the New Democracy Party is using features of governmental inconsistency and, something quite important, is demagogically exploiting the just discontent of the working people and the middle classes with the government's economic policy. Although the New Democracy Party, having suffered an electoral defeat, is currently in a state of protracted crisis, it is making great efforts to restructure itself and its possibilities should not be underestimated. We must also take into consideration the fact that it has retained its influence on some toiling strata and, as before, has strong positions in the state mechanism and enjoys the great support of the economic oligarchy and imperialism.

While directing all our efforts toward rebuffing the counterattacks of imperialism and the oligarchy, we also stress that they cannot be effectively repelled so long as the government has not put an end to the policy of concessions and agreements involving big capital or making compromises such as, for example, the agreement on American bases, and so long as it has not abandoned its aspiration to reject bipartisanship, ignoring the support of the popular movement or, as is frequently the case, arrogantly erecting artificial barriers on the path of the people's masses.

In analyzing the currently developing situation and supporting the positive steps which have been taken and to the implementation of which it made its contribution, our party emphasizes that in order to consolidate achievements and isolate the reactionary forces, the country must continue firmly to follow its new course. This will allow it once and for all to break with the past when servility and the illegality and rule of the oligarchy prevailed, and to lay the foundations of an independent, peaceful Greek state of the working people, which will take the path of antimonopoly democratic development.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

YEAR 1983; MOST IMPORTANT TRENDS IN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 83 (signed to press 13 Dec 83)
pp 96-107

[Review by Yu. Molchanov and V. Nekrasov]

[Text] One more year in the history of the 20th century--the century of revolutionary tempests and upheavals and of unparalleled changes in the life of mankind--has ended. This was a year filled with a number of events of varying significance, scale and level but, in the final account, all linked to the main event characterizing our age--the class confrontation between socialism and capitalism, the two confronting social systems, totally opposite outlooks and political courses in world affairs. The main and determining feature in the unparalleled aggravation of this confrontation in 1983 was the fact that the forces of socialism, progress and peace retained the strategic initiative. The capitalist world, which experienced the further intensification of a general crisis, became increasingly entangled in domestic and international antagonisms and conflicts. It was opposed by the socialist world which was confidently implementing its constructive plans and building a high road in history.

The steady and comprehensive increase in the interest shown by the people's masses in the scientific theory of the revolutionary renovation of the world is a characteristic feature of our time. The gratitude and respect expressed by the peoples in 1983 for the memory of Karl Marx, the brilliant founder of scientific communism, on the occasion of the 165th anniversary of his birth and centennial of his death, was a vivid confirmation of the inordinately increased prestige and attractiveness of the ideas of socialism. The progressive forces of our time check their plans and policies against the guidelines set in the doctrine of Marx-Engels-Lenin, enriched by the tremendous experience of the international labor and all revolutionary movements. The ascension of the peoples toward the peaks of social progress is growing and broadening under the banner of Marxism-Leninism--the most influential ideological trend in mankind's history.

Frightened by the defeats inflicted on the capitalist world in its competition against socialism, the reactionary imperialist circles are trying to hold back the course of global developments by drastically aggravating international tension and making weapons and readiness to resort to them the yardstick of the potency of social systems. As a result of the aggressive actions of the reactionary imperialist forces, the threat of outbreak of

nuclear war tangibly grew in 1983. The question of the salvation of the future of human civilization and of life itself on earth assumed particular urgency. At the same time, the unification of all healthy forces of mankind in the struggle against the terrible danger took place on an unprecedented scale.

During the worsened international situation of 1983 as well, the Soviet people confidently continued their progress, achieving new successes in constructive activities, surmounting obstacles and difficulties, rejecting the obsolete and daringly adopting and asserting the new. The dedicated efforts of the Soviet people yielded substantial results. The power of the Soviet state increased tangibly; its defense capability was strengthened and the material and cultural living standards of the people were enhanced. The further intensification and increased effectiveness of public production and achieving the best possible end results with the lowest possible outlays remained the focal points of attention of the party and all Soviet working people. Virtually all indicators of the status of the national economy, which began to develop at a faster pace, were improved during the year. Compared to the first 10 months of 1982, the increased overall volume of industrial output during the first 10 months of 1983 averaged 4.2 percent as compared to the planned figure of 3.2 percent; during the same period labor productivity increased by 3.6 percent. The implementation of planned assignments for the production of many most important types of industrial commodities developed at a faster pace. The country's agriculture harvested and procured more grain, vegetables and fruits. Substantial changes occurred in the development of animal husbandry. The steps taken for the implementation of the Food Program created more favorable economic conditions for kolkhoz and sovkhoz work and contributed to resolving the problem of ensuring the stability of agriculture and the considerable growth of its productivity.

The growth of the population's real income continued. Salaries and benefits from social consumption funds increased; the construction of housing and cultural and consumer projects continued at a high pace. Concerned with the further improvement in the well-being of the Soviet people, the CPSU Central Committee deemed it necessary to undertake the elaboration of a comprehensive program for the development of consumer goods and services.

The June CPSU Central Committee Plenum, which took place in a spirit of true Leninist approach to the solution of imminent problems, intolerance of shortcomings, realism and perspicacity in formulating the major objectives and tasks, was a most important event in the life of the party and the entire Soviet people. In the aftermath of the June Plenum, the November 1982 Plenum concretized the resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress in terms of the vital needs related to economic construction and ideological work. Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, delivered an outstanding programmatic speech in which he formulated short- and long-term main tasks related to communist upbringing, the shaping of the new man and the struggle for peace and social progress. "It is important not only to earmark clear and thought-out guidelines for the future," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov emphasized, "but also to make millions of party and nonparty people aware of them, so that they may actively involve themselves in the work to be done."

The plenum provided a creative interpretation of the experience acquired in the areas of CPSU ideological and educational activities. It called for raising them to the level of the major and complex problems which the party is resolving at the present stage and linking more closely ideological work with the struggle for the implementation of key national economic and sociopolitical tasks. As the plenum decree emphasized, "the implementation of the party's line of advancing developed socialism will enable us to take another major step forward in the building of communism and will prove even more convincingly the advantages of the socialist system and increase its attractiveness."

Guided by the superior interests of the party and the people, at the June session of the USSR Supreme Soviet the delegates unanimously elected Comrade Yu. V. Andropov chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. This decision was warmly approved by the entire Soviet people as contributing to the enhancement of the leading and guiding role of the CPSU and the more successful solution of the problems of building communism and strengthening peace on earth.

The USSR Supreme Soviet session heard a report on the international situation and Soviet foreign policy and passed a corresponding decree. It also passed the Law on Labor Collectives and on enhancing their role in the management of enterprises, establishments and organizations developing the Leninist ideas of the extensive participation of the working people in production management.

The party's stipulations related to the planned and comprehensive advancement of the developed socialist society were of a broad and innovative nature. As was emphasized at the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum, the USSR has entered a stage in which profound quality changes have taken place in production forces with corresponding improvements in production relations. The changes in the minds of the people, in the entire social setup must be closely related to this. The further development of these problems in the course of the continuing preparations for the formulation of a new draft of the party program, as resolved by the 26th CPSU Congress, is of the greatest importance. This program will be the party's main ideological-theoretical document which will provide the strategic directions of our entire activities over a long period of time.

Throughout 1983 the CPSU Central Committee and its Politburo did a great deal of work along the main directions earmarked in the resolutions of the 26th Congress and subsequent Central Committee plenums. Steps were formulated and taken to ensure production intensification, improve the style of management of all aspects of the country's life, enhance the exigency toward cadres and many others. Considerable attention was paid to strengthening organization and order. As a result, 1983 was marked by an upsurge in the country's entire sociopolitical life and the improved work of party, soviet and economic organs and the enhanced level of planning and labor discipline.

The Soviet people unanimously support the firm CPSU line of ensuring the safety of the homeland and safeguarding the interests of its friends and allies. It counters the intrigues of the imperialist enemies of peace with

its monolithic unity and inflexible belief in the justice of Lenin's great cause and daily persistent efforts to strengthen the socialist fatherland, thus fulfilling its patriotic and internationalist duty.

The great political and labor upsurge which characterized the situation in the country and the nationwide approval of the CPSU's domestic and foreign policy, the 80th anniversary of which was solemnly marked last summer is a vivid manifestation of the unbreakable unity of the Soviet people rallied around the communist party and its Leninist Central Committee. As the current accountability and election party meetings and conferences convincingly prove, the communists in the land of the soviets have adopted the party's line as their own and are demonstrating the unity of party ranks and their infinite loyalty to the Leninist course.

The members of the socialist commonwealth successfully resolved the problems related to their development. During the first half of 1983 their gross industrial output was 4.3 percent higher than during the same period of 1982. This growth was particularly noticeable in sectors which ensure the acceleration of scientific and technical progress. Real population income and the volume of retail trade increased in virtually all fraternal countries and labor conditions improved. The increased economic potential of the members of the commonwealth and the increased well-being of the people's masses helped the further growth of the reputation and strengthened the general positions of socialism throughout the world.

In the course of the implementation of current national economic plans, each of the fraternal countries concentrated on resolving its specific problems and strove to implement particularly important targets at the present stage. Thus, the GDR successfully implemented measures to conserve energy and use contemporary material- and energy-saving technologies. Hungary paid close attention to improving the balance of its economy as a whole while Bulgaria concentrated on updating production facilities by applying essentially new technologies and improving its capital investments structure. Considerable successes were recorded by the working people of heroic Cuba on the occasion of the great 25th anniversary of their revolution.

Despite existing difficulties, enhanced by economic "sanctions" applied by the United States, Poland continued to solve the assignments set with its three-year national economic plan for coming out of the crisis, achieving an economic balance and laying firm foundations for future progress. The PZPR rebuilt its forces and its ability to perform a leading role in society. The political situation became gradually normalized. Improvements were made in virtually all fields of life. As a result of all this the state of emergency was lifted throughout Polish territory in July 1983. The Soviet Union and the other fraternal countries provided throughout the year political, economic and moral support to the Polish people in their efforts to rebuild the forces of the socialist state.

As indicated by practical experience, the achievements of the socialist countries are increasing as a result of their constant interaction and cooperation and participation in resolving their common problems. As the fraternal

parties emphasize, the need to strengthen the unity and cohesion of the socialist commonwealth in the political, economic and military areas and to enhance the effectiveness of their joint activities was confirmed particularly strongly by the international events in 1983.

Regular summit bilateral and multilateral meetings were held by representatives of the fraternal countries. A conference was held by the heads of governments of the members of the socialist commonwealth; ministers of foreign affairs and defense of Warsaw Pact member countries met periodically and so did secretaries of the central committees of the fraternal ruling parties, in charge of international and ideological problems. Consultations were held in the course of these and other meetings on basic political problems. Information was exchanged and coordinated actions were developed. Thus, the jointly defined general course became an even stronger blend of the views and positions of the fraternal countries.

Life convincingly proves that the growth of the economic potential of the members of the socialist commonwealth and close national economic cooperation make them invulnerable to any attempts at blackmail undertaken by the imperialists and constitute a reliable foundation for strengthening their positions in the struggle for peace and international safety. At the same time, the experience of the socialist countries teaches them that the requirements of scientific and technical progress face them with the task of further improving the international socialist division of labor and all types of economic and scientific and technical cooperation. The question of the full use by each one of them of the experience in the realm of economics acquired by the other socialist countries becomes even more urgent.

The 37th CEMA session, which was held in Berlin on 18-20 October, clearly proved the basic commonness of the approach of the fraternal countries to problems of economic intensification, improving the national economic structures and mobilizing intraeconomic reserves. The session earmarked steps for the further concentration of the efforts of the members of the commonwealth in resolving priority scientific and technical problems. It approved the basic lines for expanding cooperation in the economical and efficient utilization of fuel-energy and raw material resources as well as a number of additional steps aimed at the interaction and development of the agroindustrial sectors.

Completing preparations for the planned economic summit by the CEMA countries was an essential result of the joint work done by the representatives of the socialist countries at the Berlin session. Problems related to upgrading the effectiveness of their interaction and prospects for the further development of multilateral cooperation will be considered at the meeting.

The peoples of the fraternal countries were forced to resolve their constructive problems in building a new society in difficult international circumstances. Imperialist reaction did everything possible to discredit real socialism, undermine its global positions and weaken its unity. In 1983 it unleashed a literal political and economic aggression against the socialist commonwealth.

The fraternal countries countered the intrigues of imperialist circles with their common resolve to defend the inviolability of their borders, ensure the reliability of all units within the commonwealth and defend the socialist gains. Attempts to exert pressure on the world of real socialism through "sanctions" and other discriminatory measures in the field of trade failed as well. The ahead-of-schedule completion of the Urengoy-Pomary-Uzhgorod main gas pipeline, this unique engineering and technical system in the world, convincingly proved the ability of the USSR and the fraternal socialist countries successfully to resolve most complex problems despite all hindrances on the part of imperialist reaction.

Practical experience indicates that improvements of international ties among socialist countries is a lengthy and occasionally convoluted process. The fact, however, that it is based on coinciding basic interests shared by all fraternal countries and a common system helps, in the final account, to surmount differences in views and assessments which arise between countries, particularly given the sincere aspiration to achieve mutual understanding for the sake of the triumph of the cause of peace and socialism. This precisely is the foundation of the policy which the Soviet Union pursues toward all socialist countries.

In 1983 as well the USSR continued to work for normalizing relations with the People's Republic of China on the basis of reciprocity. It looked for possibilities of gradually expanding bilateral relations and contacts, convinced that such a normalization--naturally not achieved to the detriment of other countries--was consistent with the basic interests of both countries and would be of great importance given the current international situation. The new round of Sino-Soviet consultations, which took place in Beijing last October, was considered useful to both parties. The Soviet Union favors the continuation of this political dialogue.

Last year the international situation of the socialist countries remained firm and hopeful. In building and strengthening a new society in which the working man is the master of life, these countries embody today more than ever before the hopes of all nations for the triumph of the ideals of peace and social justice.

To the capitalist world 1983 was a year of major instability on the socio-economic plane, based on the intensifying general crisis and the reactionary and aggressive policy of the rulers. The increasingly entangled struggle on matters of war and peace and problems caused by social antagonisms were characteristic features of the situation.

In 1983 the economies of the United States and a number of other developed capitalist countries showed certain upswing features after the 1980-1982 decline. However, this revival was weak and unstable, leading many experts to believe that it will be of short duration and bring about a new decline soon. According to official data alone the number of fully unemployed people in the developed capitalist countries reached 35 million. The 1983 events in the capitalist world confirmed that by virtue of the effect of objective economic laws capitalist society is becoming increasingly dragged

into a lengthy period of slowdown in its development pace, growing social conflicts and intensified conservative and reactionary trends in the policies and ideology of the ruling class.

The reactionary circles sought a solution to the aggravated contradictions within capitalist society both through drastically energizing the aggressive nature of imperialist foreign policy and the intensification of the arms race as well as increasing the exploitation of the working people, accompanied by an open onslaught on their rights. In particular, monopoly capital was able to achieve a substantial drop in real wages of most categories of hired labor (by 19 percent in the United States over the past 10 years), and further cuts in expenditures for housing construction, health care and other social areas.

In the political sphere the bourgeois ruling circles made a clear effort to swing its axis to the right and to promote the ascension to power of more reactionary parties and groups. The alliance between the largest monopolies and the military-industrial segment of the state acted as the main force in the conduct of this strategic maneuver. The preaching of anticommunism, carried out by the propaganda apparatus of the capitalist countries, was combined with an energizing of chauvinistic feelings and nationalistic and racist prejudices. The ruling conservative parties and coalitions strengthened their positions in the FRG and Great Britain as a result of the 1983 elections held in those countries. Certain shifting to the right was shown as a result of the elections in Austria. At the same time, however, Portugal and Italy joined the group of countries the governments of which are headed by socialists and social democrats, such as France, Spain and Greece.

The wave of proletarian strikes in defense of the living standards of the working people and their right to work did not decline throughout the year. Mass marches by unemployed and the creation of new public organizations to defend the interests of the jobless and, therefore, of people without any guaranteed means of existence, became characteristic phenomena in the social life in capitalist countries. As a whole, we can say that the process of politicizing of the people's masses and their involvement in active actions intensified significantly.

The world of the liberated countries experienced the heavy blows of the economic crisis in the developed capitalist countries. The pace of the economic development of these countries was reduced further and the number of their totally or partially unemployed labor force reached one-third of the entire able-bodied population. The pumping of resources from the liberated countries by the multinational monopolies and the militarization of their economies, imposed by the imperialists, deprived them of means for accumulation and lowered their import possibilities. As a result, per capita income in these countries declined for the third consecutive year. Governmental indebtedness of the developing countries increased and reached \$700 billion.

Last year the confrontation, which had assumed an exceptionally sharp and stubborn nature, continued to develop in the world arena along two political lines: the line of imperialism, which was one of aggravation of tension, confrontation, aggression and preparations for war, and the line of socialism,

of the elimination of the threat of war, the preservation and consolidation of peace and the restoration of detente.

The reactionary and antihumane nature of imperialism, its readiness to commit the most monstrous crimes for the sake of its selfish objectives and accounts, its aspiration to act in a provocatively impudent and insolent manner, grossly violating the sovereignty and independence of countries and peoples and norms of international law, were exposed even further. This found its concentrated expression in the policies and actions of the current American administration with its heavy anticommunism and anti-Sovietism, arrogant political ignorance, extremism and imperial hegemonism.

The 29 September 1983 statement by Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, offered an exhaustive class analysis and an accurate and comprehensive assessment of the foreign policy course of the U.S. administration: "...It is a militaristic course which constitutes a major threat to peace. Its essence is to ignore the interests of other countries and peoples and to try to secure for the United States dominant positions in the world."

All the efforts and plans of the American administration were directed precisely toward the implementation of this criminal objective. It thoughtlessly promoted further tension in international relations which reached an exceptionally high point toward the end of the year and brought mankind even closer to the dangerous limit of thermonuclear war with its inevitably catastrophic consequences.

The threat of war continued to increase above all as a result of the fact that in their attempt to achieve military superiority over the USSR and the other Warsaw Pact members, the United States and its NATO partners undertook broad practical steps to implement their man-hating plans. "Peace must be based on strength" was the theme song of the innumerable speeches delivered by the American president. "The possibility of safeguarding peace (naturally, in the American way--the authors) can be provided only through military superiority such as the United States had in the 1950s and 1960s," Caspar Weinberger, the American secretary of defense, specified. For this reason, he said, "the United States must strengthen its positions in the world through arms."

It was no accident that with their emphasis on war and the economic exhaustion of the socialist countries, the U.S. ruling circles conducted the international talks on problems of disarmament over the past year not with a view to achieving mutual agreements but merely for purposes of disorientation and misleading the public, submitting obviously unacceptable suggestions and conditions. "The arms limitation talks are a trap to which we are simply forced to resort in order to calm down the American people and our European allies," said C. Adelman, who was appointed by Reagan chief of the Disarmament Control Agency.

In their desire to break the military-strategic parity existing between the United States and the USSR and attain superiority, as in the past, the White

House and the Pentagon particularly relied on the accelerated development and deployment of essentially new types of mass destruction weapons. The purpose was to outstrip the USSR in the development of such weapons and thus gain, even if for a certain period of time, a certain possibility for blackmail, the extraction of political concessions and the pursuit of a policy "from a position of strength" and, at the proper time, also deal a first strike in the insane hope of winning a nuclear war.

This was essentially the direction of the extensive programs announced by Reagan and actively implemented by the United States for rearming all strategic nuclear forces, and the development of the huge MX intercontinental ballistic missiles, new nuclear submarines, strategic bombers, neutron bombs, and so on.

Yielding to the pressure of the administration, in 1983 the American Congress approved the production and deployment of the new MX superpowerful strategic missiles. There also are plans for starting the fast development of an essentially new Midgetman small intercontinental missile which carries a single warhead. The military budget for the 1984 fiscal year, which exceeds \$280 billion, stipulates among other things the purchasing of large numbers of intercontinental MX missiles, the B-1 new strategic bombers, the cruise missiles and the Pershing 2 missiles. Work is intensifying on the implementation of the program for chemical rearmament, announced by Reagan as early as 1981. The new budget allocates \$124 million especially for the production of a particularly dangerous type of chemical weapon--the binary gas shells.

Rudely challenging all mankind and in violation of existing international agreements, in his 23 March television address Reagan publicly proclaimed that the United States is initiating preparations for combat operations in and from outer space. The leader of the White House called for the creation of a huge near space antimissile defense system consisting of 100 military orbital stations equipped with laser and ray weapons.

With this course of militarization of near space, Washington is clearly hoping to be able to neutralize in the future, through action from outer space, the effect of Soviet intercontinental ballistic missiles which could deal a retaliatory strike, thus ensuring U.S. invulnerability and superiority. This would offer the American military and political leadership extensive opportunities for engaging in imperial diktat.

Many noted military experts, some of them American, have subsequently proved the groundlessness of the hopes expressed by the present administration of avoiding the terrible retribution of the Soviet Union and have reached the conclusion that no nuclear shield could protect the aggressor. "Achieving nuclear superiority is impossible," said the American Alliance of Concerned Scientists in its statement. Clearly, transferring the arms race to outer space would drastically aggravate the military confrontation and increase the risk of military catastrophe.

The practical preparations which were undertaken to implement the NATO decision to deploy new American medium-range Pershing 2 and Tomahawk missiles

in several Western European countries created particular stress and tension in the international situation in 1983. This marked the concentration of the direct and immediate hopes of the Pentagon for breaking the military-strategic parity, for the new missiles could hit targets deep inside Soviet territory.

The assertions of official NATO representatives to the effect that the "Pershings" and "Tomahawks" will merely counterbalance the SS-20 and other similar Soviet missiles deployed in the European part of the country are clear misrepresentations. Actually, the new American medium-range nuclear missiles, some of which could reach their targets 6 to 8 minutes after launching, will be targeted on Soviet strategic nuclear forces and have a first-strike potential.

In the course of pursuing its dangerous plans, Washington is increasingly tying to its aggressive militaristic course its NATO allies. The support given American policy on the part of several Western European governments clearly proves a substantial shift in their positions to the detriment of their national interests and for the sake of the so-called "Western solidarity."

The factual deployment of the new American missiles in Western Europe, which was initiated at the end of 1983, was a clear manifestation of the thoughtlessness with which Washington is gambling with the fates of other nations. While openly challenging the Soviet Union and the other members of the Warsaw Pact, at the same time it destabilized even further and worsened the situation not only in Europe but throughout the rest of the world.

The past year provided a number of new proofs of the hegemonistic and expansionist aspirations of American imperialism threatening all mankind. Through the pretext of declaring as "vital interest" zones entire areas located thousands of kilometers from the U.S. borders, Washington continued to expand its military presence in them, creating bridgeheads for armed intervention in the affairs of countries which reject the diktat from overseas.

By Pentagon decision, a new "central command" became operational as of 1 January 1983. It has jurisdiction over the expansionistic "rapid deployment forces," and a sphere of action arbitrarily extended over 19 countries in the southern part of Asia, the Middle East and Africa. According to some information the Reagan administration intends to double its "rapid deployment forces" from 220,000 to 440,000 men and to increase by one-third the size of its special-purpose "Green Beret" detachments.

The imperialist countries, headed by the United States, are converting with increasing impudence from threats addressed to the young independent countries and national liberation movements to direct military actions and naked force, operating not only with the help of reactionary puppet regimes or mercenaries but also their own armed forces.

The undeclared war by the forces of imperialism and reaction against the people's regime in Afghanistan continued. The aggression mounted by the

South African racists against Angola and Mozambique went on and there was an open imperialist armed intervention in Chad's internal affairs on the African continent. The course of events in the Middle East assumed an increasingly dangerous and tragic nature. Here the "strategic partnership" between the United States and Israel was intensified further. This was manifested, in particular, in the creation of a joint military-political committee and direct military actions on the part of the American military against the Lebanese patriots.

The situation in Central America as well became increasingly stressed. Here the United States continued its campaign of blackmail of and threats directed at socialist Cuba. Nicaragua, threatened by the Pentagon with direct armed intervention, became the target of uninterrupted aggressive intrigues while dozens of navy ships sailed toward its shores.

Last year the predatory aggression committed against the small island state of Grenada was the peak of American imperialist cynicism. Grenada was "guilty" only of pursuing a policy independent of the United States. Its sovereignty and autonomy were literally crushed by the American military. This bloody terrorist action clearly exposed the full nature of the course pursued by the current American administration which has promoted international piracy and violence to the rank of state policy. The Grenadan tragedy most clearly exposed the major danger which Washington's policy brings to countries in Latin America, Asia and Africa and the cause of freedom and peace. However, if Washington hoped to frighten and bring in line the peoples of other countries through such actions, the results turned out to be the direct opposite. The aggression triggered the angry objection and condemnation of broad international circles and turned into an impressive moral and political defeat for the Reagan administration.

An entire series of events in 1983 exposed the tendency of national imperialism to engage in joint or coordinated activities throughout the world. It was clearly manifested in the course of the traditional conference of heads of the seven largest capitalist countries--the United States, Great Britain, France, the FRG, Italy, Canada and Japan--which was held toward the end of May in Williamsburg, a small American town, where on the insistence of the American administration, particular attention was paid to the theme of "Western world solidarity" in the face of the notorious "Soviet military threat." The participants in the conference adopted a "Political Declaration on Security Problems," drafted by the White House, in which they expressed their support of the militaristic foreign policy course pursued by the United States and, in particular, the plans for deploying new American missiles in Western Europe. This was the first time that Japan officially joined in a declaration by NATO countries. Essentially, this means a qualitatively new feature in its involvement in NATO activities and a new stage in shaping a broad military-political coalition, some kind of new "axis" linking Washington, Western Europe and Tokyo, the purpose of which is the strategic encirclement of the USSR.

In assigning Japan an important place in its aggressive and expansionist aspirations, Washington accelerated its militarization by opening on Japanese

soil increasingly new bases for the American armed forces. As acknowledged by Japan's Prime Minister Nakasone, henceforth his country will serve as an "unsinkable aircraft carrier" (for the American air force--the author) and, on the basis of its "security treaty" with the United States, "will be performing the role of a defense shield for Western strategy in the Far East."

The tendency of the reactionary forces to consolidate was also reflected in the establishment of some kind of "international democratic alliance" in the summer of 1983 at the London meeting of senior representatives of 22 conservative and right-wing parties of 19 countries in Europe and America, and Australia and New Zealand. The line pursued by the Washington ruling circles is becoming increasingly clear as they try to gather under the black flags of the antisocialist "crusade" they have declared all kinds of reactionary, right-wing and conservative circles in the struggle against the forces of socialism, democracy and progress. This is taking place under the accompaniment of uncerecermonious and highfalutin White House declarations concerning their right, just about God-given, to decide on the destinies of the world and not only to admonish but to force other countries and peoples to follow the American way of life. Remembering the possessed Fuehrer, the people are well-familiar with the tragic consequences of adventuristic and criminal plans for attaining world domination.

President Reagan approaches existing problems and occurring events exclusively from the positions of a pathological anticommunism and fierce hatred for the Soviet Union, socialism and everything progressive. In its efforts somehow to justify its dangerous man-hating policy, the Washington administration is piling up mountains of slanders against the USSR and the socialist system which it labels the "hub of evil." The refined and criminal provocation organized by the U.S. Special Services, making use of the South Korean airplane, was the most outstanding example of its most extreme adventurism.

"If anyone has held illusions on the possibility of any development for the better in the policies of the current American administration, recent events have scattered them once and for all," noted Comrade Yu. V. Andropov in his 29 September declaration. "For the sake of attaining its imperialist objectives it goes so far that no question can be raised as to whether Washington has any limits at which any thinking person should stop." Last year's events clearly revealed an essentially different political trend of today. Countering the feverish subversive activities of frantic reactionary and imperialist circles who are deliberately aggravating the international situation, the peace-loving forces are becoming energized. A broad worldwide antiwar coalition has developed which, in the final account, will be able to restrain the nuclear maniacs.

The development of international life reaffirms convincingly that the Soviet Union and the other fraternal socialist countries are the reliable guarantors of the peace and security of the nations and the elimination of the threat of war. In the current exceptionally difficult international situation, with its political storms and conflicts, the Peace Program of the 24th-26th CPSU Congress, which enjoys the support of the other socialist countries, is a tried and tested compass of our party's and Soviet states' foreign policy.

The statements by Comrade Yu. V. Andropov and his speeches and answers to questions asked by the press became documents of tremendous political significance for all mankind. These documents, which provide a profound and comprehensive analysis of the extreme danger of the international situation which developed as a result of the aggressive militaristic line of American imperialism, contain new constructive initiatives on major problems and clearly demonstrate the loyalty of the Soviet Union to the Leninist peace-loving foreign policy course and its resolve to struggle for restraining the forces of militarism and preventing the world from sliding toward nuclear war. The assessments and conclusions drawn by Comrade Yu. V. Andropov and his constructive proposals were met with warm approval by the working people in the Soviet Union and the extensive support of the peoples of the fraternal socialist countries, the communist and worker parties and the organizations and movements of the peace-loving public.

The joint and coordinated foreign policy course charted by the fraternal socialist states, distinguished by its sustained and realistic nature, principle-mindedness and consistency and great responsibility for the fate of the world, is a most important factor in the struggle for the prevention of a thermonuclear catastrophe and for settling imminent international problems. The 4-5 January 1983 conference of the Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Pact Members, which took place in Prague, was a major event. The political declaration it adopted formulates a program of specific steps aimed at restraining the arms race, disarmament, and strengthening the peace and security of all nations.

"While realistically assessing the situation in the world arena, the members of the commonwealth also particularly emphasized their firm belief that the current course of events can and must be stopped and that their development must take a line consistent with the expectation of the nations.... The forces of peace are more powerful than the forces of war. Everything depends on their unity and the purposefulness of their actions."

The new exceptionally valuable initiative launched by the fraternal countries of concluding a treaty on the reciprocal nonuse of military force and supporting relations of peace between Warsaw Pact and NATO members triggered a great response throughout the world. The conclusion of such a legal contractual act would make it possible to reduce the level of international tension and the threat of war and would contribute to the restoration of trust between countries.

This new constructive proposal the implementation of which requires nothing more than good will met with the approval and support not only of the broad circles of the peace-loving public but a number of neutral and nonaligned countries. It was indicative that the Bureau of the Socialist International spoke out in favor of concluding an agreement on the nonuse of force between NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

On 28 June the participants of the meeting of leading party and state leaders of the seven socialist countries, who met in Moscow, once again and most firmly spoke out against competition in the area of nuclear armaments and

turned "to all countries with the urgent appeal to weigh soberly and objectively the threatening trends in the current development of international relations and to draw sensible conclusions consistent with the most profound interests of mankind."

Inflexibly following the Leninist foreign policy course and coordinating its actions with the other socialist countries, throughout 1983 the Soviet Union developed in the course of a firm confrontation with imperialist policy an active peaceful offensive and firmly retained the initiative. The attention of the entire world public was drawn to the numerous radical, daring, realistic and constructive Soviet diplomatic initiatives.

Thus, for example, while continuing the difficult discussions in Geneva with the United States on limiting and reducing strategic armaments, the Soviet Union systematically pursued a line of reaching an effective agreement on the basis of the principle of equality and identical security by suggesting truly significant and equal reductions in strategic armaments and the reduction by 25 percent of the number of carriers of such weapons to 1,800 units per side. This would mark a reduction of all components of strategic forces, such as intercontinental ballistic missiles based on the ground and ballistic missiles on submarines and heavy bombers. A ban on the development of cruise missiles would block new channels for the stockpiling of strategic weapons.

As in the past, the American side erected obstacles on the path to reaching an agreement, hypocritically discussing its desire for an agreement and readiness to make "profound" cuts while, in fact, trying to secure major military advantages for the United States. It is the view of the USSR that success in the START talks can be achieved providing that the security of neither of the parties is harmed and efforts to obtain unilateral advantages are abandoned.

The Soviet Union's proposal of concluding an international treaty on a total ban on testing and developing any kind of space weapons and radically resolving the problem of antisatellite weapons was a new demonstration of good will. The Soviet Union called for an agreement to eliminate already existing antisatellite systems and banning the development of new ones. The USSR assumed the obligation not to be first to introduce any kind of antisatellite weapons in outer space, i.e., it proclaimed a unilateral moratorium as long as other countries, including the United States, would abstain from placing antisatellite weapons in outer space. The Soviet Union submitted for discussion by the 38th UN General Assembly Session the question "On Concluding a Treaty Banning the Use of Force in Outer Space and From Outer Space to Earth." These initiatives on the part of the USSR triggered a broad positive response and the approval of the international community. "Yu. Andropov, the Soviet leader, is actively seeking control over armaments," wrote THE NEW YORK TIMES. "The opportunity, the last, perhaps, of preventing the moving of the arms race to outer space has now appeared."

Guided by a clear understanding of the catastrophic consequences of a possible nuclear conflict, the Soviet Union suggested that the UN General Assembly discuss the question of "condemning nuclear war" and called upon the

world community to condemn decisively and unreservedly war as the most monstrous of all crimes which could be committed against nations and to declare criminal the formulation and propaganda of military-political doctrines based on the "legitimacy" of the first use of nuclear weapons and, in general, the "admissibility" of unleashing a nuclear war.

The range of efforts undertaken by the Soviet Union and the other fraternal countries with a view to lifting the threat of war and strengthening international security was distinguished by great scope and variety, ranging from large-scale political actions to numerous specific suggestions made during the talks. Socialist diplomacy, which combined firmness in defending principle-minded positions with tactical flexibility and readiness to reach sensible compromises, is acting energetically and on a broad front. This enables it to exert a restraining influence on the adventuristic aspirations of imperialist circles and to make a decisive contribution to safeguarding peace.

The political weight and prestige of the nonaligned movement were enhanced even further last year. Despite all of its internal difficulties and differences, it remains an influential force actively opposing the threat of war and favoring peace, peaceful coexistence and equal and mutually profitable cooperation among countries. The growing awareness of the danger of imperialism and an understanding of the importance of unity of action marked the 7th Conference of Heads of States and Governments of Nonaligned Countries, which was held in New Delhi in March 1983. Thanks to the efforts of a number of countries, India in particular--the new chairman of the nonaligned movement--the anti-imperialist and antimilitaristic course predominated at the conference. The most topical problems of our time became the focal points of discussion: lifting the threat of war, strengthening peace, and ensuring the practical implementation of the principles of a new international economic order. As I. Gandhi, the Indian prime minister, said, "Today the alternative to peaceful coexistence is the end of all existence." The voice of the non-aligned countries is heard with increasing firmness and decisiveness in the United Nations and other international forums.

The mass worldwide antiwar movement is becoming a powerful social force with a substantial impact on politics. This was vividly confirmed at the World Assembly for Peace and Life and Against Nuclear War, which was held in Prague last June and was attended by more than 3,000 delegates from 132 countries, representing 68 communist and workers parties, 49 national democratic parties and liberation movements and 40 socialist, social democratic and centrist and 11 Christian democratic and conservative parties. It was worth noting that 80 percent of the participants came from capitalist and liberated countries.

This forum, the largest in the history of peace-loving forces, turned to the peoples on earth with a warm appeal comprehensively to energize their efforts and unity in the struggle for preserving peace and ensuring the future of mankind. "Preparations for nuclear war are the most severe crime against mankind," the assembly's appeal stated. "However, war is not inevitable. There is still time to prevent a nuclear catastrophe. The salvation lies in the hands of the nations themselves, in the hands of every man and woman firmly fighting for the cause of peace."

New serious warnings of the inevitably fatal consequences of a nuclear war and highly humane appeals to prevent the catastrophe were sounded also at the Third International Congress of the Movement of "World Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War," the All-Union Conference of Scientists for Rescuing Mankind from the Threat of Nuclear War and for Disarmament and Peace, and other numerous gatherings of scientists, men of culture and clergymen.

The broad mass antiwar movement reached a truly unparalleled scope. Millions of concerned people rushed into the streets and squares of cities in various countries, firmly demanding an end to the arms race, a stop to the nuclear madness and the taking of urgent steps for the salvation of mankind while there is still time. This was a true referendum and a spontaneous manifestation of the will of nations on a gigantic scale.

The ruling NATO circles, who love to speculate on "Western democracy" and "human rights," hurled on the participants in the antiwar movement a flood of propaganda demagoguery and slander in an effort to discredit and cast aspersions on this movement, divide it and protect itself from the people's will behind police lines, clubs, water cannons and tear gas. Thousands of patriots were subjected to repressive measures and thrown in jail. None of this, however, broke down their will and warm desire to secure peaceful skies over the heads of present and future generations.

Given the fact that, ignoring their demands, the governments of a number of Western European countries opened their doors to the new American nuclear weapons does not mean the total defeat of the mass antiwar movement. Only one battle has been lost but the main one still lies ahead. Noteworthy in this connection was the decision of the Danish parliament to dissociate itself from the deployment of new American missiles.

The basic problems of the future of Europe and the safety and well-being of its countries and peoples, closely linked to the global problems of war and peace, became the epicenter of the sharpest confrontation in the international arena last year. In looking at this continent through the lens of its hegemonistic aspirations, Washington assigns to it the fate of the first "theater of military operations" in a so-called "limited" or "local" nuclear war, while the Western European allies are assigned the role of hostages. This is one of the elements of NATO's (read American!) plan for the deployment of nearly 600 new nuclear missiles in Western European countries.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and all peace-loving forces are showing a radically different and truly responsible and sensible approach to the fate of Europe. Their thoughts and actions are aimed at ensuring this continent, with its rich history and priceless cultural heritage, a peaceful future and to its peoples the possibility of living and developing under conditions of good neighborly relations and mutually profitable cooperation. They firmly oppose the various types of plans for "further rearmament of Europe" and favor radical measures for reducing the size of forces and armaments, lowering the level of confrontation between the two military-political alliances and achieving greater trust among European countries.

As a result of a persistent 3-year-long struggle and at the cost of great effort the Madrid meeting of representatives of 35 countries--participants in the European Security and Cooperation Conference--ended fruitfully on 9 September 1983. The efforts of the United States and some of its NATO allies either to impose on the socialist countries clearly unacceptable stipulations or, in general, to torpedo the Madrid meeting, failed.

The final document approved in Madrid was largely the result of the tireless efforts of the Soviet Union and the other members of the Warsaw Pact, who displayed energy and persistence during the talks as well as flexibility in order to reach mutually acceptable decisions. The neutral and nonaligned countries made a major contribution to the positive conclusion of the Madrid meeting. Naturally, a number of stipulations in the final document are compromises. However, they were not passed to the detriment of any country.

The main positive result of the Madrid meeting was that it confirmed the "Helsinki line," i.e., the trend of detente, and that it provided a new impetus to the progress of the European-wide process. This was manifested in the general agreement to convene a conference on measures to strengthen faith and security and disarmament in Europe, to be held in Stockholm in 1984.

The positive results of the Madrid meeting, as the communication on the session of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo noted, "confirms that despite all political differences and differences in the assessment of the reasons for the current status of international affairs and the tension prevailing today in Europe and in the rest of the world, countries belonging to different social systems could reach mutually acceptable agreements favoring all nations." The Madrid results represent a victory of intelligence and common sense and are a success for anyone who cares for peace and international security.

Unfortunately, last year this success was the only major political agreement reached on European problems between socialist and capitalist countries. Essentially, in all other cases the representatives of the United States and their NATO allies obstinately assumed destructive positions, rejecting the numerous initiatives brought forth by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and the neutral states, blocking mutually acceptable accords and deliberately leading the talks into a dead-end street.

Such was the case at the Vienna talks on reducing the level of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe, which have been held for the past 10 years, and which marked no progress, virtually no positive results. In an effort to advance these talks, in February 1983 the socialist countries submitted a new set of proposals; a draft comprehensive "Agreement on Reciprocal Reduction of Armed Forces and Armaments and Related Measures in Central Europe" was submitted in June. The essence of the fraternal countries' approach was that independently of existing disputes and differences on the size of NATO and Warsaw Pact forces, to take practical steps by initiating a reciprocal reduction in the level of armaments deployed in Central Europe and establishing military parity on a lower level (900,000 men per side). On that occasion again, however, the Western partners remained deaf to the proposals submitted by the socialist states.

A basically similar situation was created in connection with the Finnish suggestion of establishing a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe, and the Swedish initiative of creating a battlefield area free from nuclear weapons in Central Europe. The Soviet Union supported both suggestions and expressed valuable counterinitiatives. The governments of the NATO countries, however, refused to engage in a practical discussion of the Finnish and Swedish proposals.

World public opinion focused its closest attention on the Soviet-American talks in Geneva on limiting medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe, which took place in the course of an exceptionally stubborn and difficult struggle. The year 1983 marked the second and decisive year of such talks, considering NATO's intention to begin the deployment of the new American missiles in a number of Western European countries in December, which would make the dialogue pointless.

Guided by the principle of equality and identical security, Soviet diplomacy made persistent efforts and submitted bold resolutions aimed at achieving mutually acceptable agreements and, consequently, saving the already oversaturated European continent from new nuclear-missile stockpiles and strengthening the security of European countries. The Soviet Union systematically suggested the total removal of all types of nuclear weapons from European territory; the reciprocal and full elimination of all medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe or their reduction down to one-third; leaving on its own European territory only as many medium-range missiles as the combined missiles of Britain and France, i.e., 162; agreeing on equalizing the number of warheads on missiles and medium-range airplanes; retaining on its European part only approximately 140 launching systems for SS-20 missiles, i.e., substantially less than those of Britain and France; abstaining from transferring and deploying new SS-20 missiles in its Eastern areas, and many others.

Until the very last moment the USSR persistently and actively sought means to ensure the successful completion of the Geneva talks. However, as the 25 November declaration by Comrade Yu. V. Andropov emphasized, "from the very beginning the United States was unwilling to reach a mutually acceptable agreement in Europe and did everything possible at the Geneva talks and outside them to prevent such an agreement." It was unwilling to take into consideration the principle of equality and identical security. It rejected the Soviet proposals and stubbornly tried to impose on the Soviet Union the type of solutions which would secure for the United States and its NATO partners major one-sided advantages. Such was the nature of the so-called "zero" option, which called for the elimination of all Soviet medium-range missiles not only on the European but the Asian parts of the USSR while retaining intact similar British and French nuclear missile forces and other NATO medium-range armaments. The "intermediary option" and its modifications, which were subsequently submitted, stipulated that the Soviet Union could retain in its European part of the country as many medium-range missiles as would be deployed by the United States. Once again the Anglo-French nuclear potential and the American medium-range bombers would remain beyond the pale of the agreement.

The Soviet Union and the other members of the Warsaw Pact repeatedly warned the United States and its NATO allies most seriously of the fatal consequences of the intended deployment of new American nuclear missiles and the fact that under no circumstances would they allow any military superiority on the part of the NATO bloc and would mandatorily take the necessary reciprocal measures to ensure their own safety.

However, Washington, Bonn, London and Rome did not heed the appeals and warnings of the socialist and other peace-loving countries and the demands of the broadest possible population masses in Western Europe and began to deploy the new American nuclear missiles in the FRG, Great Britain and Italy. Such actions wrecked the possibility of reaching a mutually acceptable agreement and, in general, the continuation of the Geneva talks. They worsened even further the military and political situation in Europe and throughout the world. Under those circumstances, the Soviet Union, whose leadership had repeatedly and most responsibly stated that no one would be allowed to disturb the existing military-strategic balance, was forced to take efficient counter-measures affecting both Western European and U.S. territory.

Under the present extremely difficult and dangerous international situation, the Soviet armed forces and the armies of the other socialist countries are performing assignments of exceptional importance. They are reliably protecting the revolutionary gains and security of the fraternal peoples and states and are blocking through their military might the aggressive aspirations of the imperialist extreme reactionary circles.

The present level of development of Soviet economy, science and technology makes the solution of even the most difficult problems in the military-technical field possible. Our country can develop any type of weapon on which the enemies of peace would like to rely, be it MX or cruise missiles or any other type of armaments. Naturally, this does not mean in the least that the USSR intends blindly to emulate the United States in its thoughtless arms race. Guided by its military doctrine and relying on the level reached in the development of science and technology, the Soviet Union will follow its own way in matters of strengthening its defense capability. Marshal of the Soviet Union Comrade D. F. Ustinov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR minister of defense, emphasized, recalling the lessons of recent history, that "we must take steps and answer the increased nuclear threat. We must answer it in such a way that the feeling of self-preservation dominates over the intentions of a potential aggressor to unleash its aggression against us."

As 1984 begins, international relations are entering a new and difficult stage of development. The deployment of American medium-range nuclear missiles in a number of Western European countries, which was carried out by Washington, has erected additional serious obstacles to ensuring European and not only European peace and security. However, even under these circumstances the CPSU and the Soviet government, displaying a truly Leninist restraint, firmness and principle-mindedness, have not interrupted their struggle for universal peace, security and cooperation. They will continue to do everything they can for reason to prevail in international relations.

Experience proves that under contemporary conditions the preservation and consolidation of peace can be achieved only by rallying the efforts of all peace-loving forces, governments, political parties, public organizations and movements, anyone who cares for the future of mankind. Never before has such a broad worldwide coalition developed as the one which is currently opposing the nuclear threat. Unquestionably, its ranks will broaden and its will to ensure the triumph of the just cause will grow.

Even under the present grave circumstances there is no hesitation in the Soviet leadership as to the line to be followed in international affairs. Convinced that no global problems, including the historical dispute between socialism and capitalism, will be resolved militarily, the USSR will continue, in close cooperation with the fraternal socialist countries and all other peace-loving forces, strictly to implement a policy of peace and struggle for the prevention of nuclear catastrophe. The Soviet people are fully resolved honorably to fulfill their duty in the struggle for the bright future of mankind.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/6

HEINE WAS RIGHT

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 83 (signed to press 13 Dec 1983)
pp 108-109

[Letter to the editors by Dr of Philosophical Sciences A. Gulyga]

[Text] Anyone familiar with the foundations of philosophy is also familiar with Hegel's famous aphorism: "What is sensible is real and what is real is sensible." Initially published in the preface to "Foundations of the Philosophy of Law" in 1820, it triggered the disagreement of many of his contemporaries, who saw in it an attempt to justify the existing order. Goethe's answer was "Not everything extant is divisible by the mind, neatly." One hundred years later, Albert Schweitzer was horrified by Hegel's words, which he interpreted simply as follows: "Our age, which led to the world war and will end with the doom of culture, was born on the night of 25 June 1820, when this sentence was written." Indeed, an apologetic attitude toward the world, filled with irreconcilable contradictions, is fraught with catastrophe.

Hegel himself sensed the ambiguity of this aphorism, and in his rewritten introduction to the "Encyclopedia of Philosophical Sciences," which was published in 1827, he explained his thought. He wrote that only God was "truly real," and that existence is merely part of reality. In daily life we describe as reality any whim, confusion, evil, and so on. In fact, however, any accidental happening does not deserve such a description.

It was Engels who brought to light the true dialectical meaning of Hegel's aphorism. He ascribed to it great importance and commented on it extensively: "... According to Hegel reality is not in the least an attribute inherent in a given social or political order under all circumstances and at all times. On the contrary, the republic of Rome was true but so also was the Roman Empire which replaced it. In 1789 the French monarchy became so unreal, i.e., became deprived of any justification to such an extent and unreasonable to such an extent that it had to be destroyed by the great revolution of which Hegel always spoke with the greatest enthusiasm. Consequently, in this case the monarchy was unreal while the revolution was real. It is precisely the same way, as we develop, that anything previously real becomes unreal, loses its need and right to exist and its reason. The place of withering-away reality is assumed by a new viable reality peacefully if the old is sufficiently sensible to die without resisting or through violence if it opposes this necessity. Therefore, this Hegelian concept,

thanks to Hegelian dialectics itself, turns into its opposite: everything real in the field of human history becomes unreasonable in the course of time, which means, consequently, that it is unreasonable by its very nature and is doomed to unreasonableness; and everything which we find in the human head is reasonable and will become reality, however much in conflict it may seem with existing reality" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 21, pp 274-275).

We also have Heine's testimony, who in his young years was Hegel's student. Once, meeting with his teacher, he expressed his dissatisfaction with the formula regarding the reasonable nature of the real. Hegel, in his words, smiled and answered: "This could be expressed also as follows: Everything which is reasonable is inevitable." The authenticity of Heine's story was doubted but was ascribed to a certain amount of poetic imagination, the more so since notes taken by the students attending Hegel's course on the philosophy of law, which he gave repeatedly, did not confirm such an interpretation. The aphorism they contained was the same as in the published text.

In 1983, however, Prof D. Henrich published a manuscript found in an American library--student notes on the course given by Hegel in 1819-1820, i.e., directly preceding the completion of the "Fundamentals of Philosophy of Law." In these notes the familiar aphorism is expressed differently: "What is sensible will become real and what is real will become sensible."

This, however, was not all. The news that a summary of an even earlier course in philosophy of the law, delivered by Hegel in 1817-1818, had been discovered in the trash in a Heidelberg second-hand bookstore, scheduled for destruction, triggered a real sensation. The course is now being prepared for publication simultaneously by two publishing houses. In it the aphorism is entirely "according to Engels, i.e., precisely as reported by Heine: 'Everything which is sensible is inevitable'" ("Alles, was vernunftig ist, mus sein"). According to D. Heinrich and Wanneman (the author of the summary), who worked also on the manuscript, the statement is repeated more than 10 times. "It is also found in the political-theoretical context of the course as a philosophical leitmotif" (G. W. F. Hegel, "Philosophie des Rechts. Die Vorlesung von 1819/20" [Philosophy of the Law. Lectures of 1819-1820], Frankfurt am Mein, 1983, p 373).

Hegel expresses himself quite radically in both lecture courses. In the lectures delivered in 1819-1820 he says that "forced law" means the right of the poor to rebel. In the Wanneman summary it is a question of the "democratic principle." The correspondent of the FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG, which published the news of the discovered manuscript, cites the following excerpt: "The monarch heading a state without a reasonable constitution subordinates the entity to his arbitrariness and could spoil everything," for which reason "there must be freely constituted civil rights and management" (FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG, 30 March 1982).

None of this is to be found in the final edition of the book "Fundamentals of Philosophy of the Law," some passages of which contain a direct apology of the reactionary Prussian monarchy. The reasons which inspired Hegel to make these corrections were of two kinds. First, increased censorship and police

repression, which affected the immediate entourage of the philosopher. Secondly, his own "corrections," as Hegel gradually distanced himself from the freedom-loving ideals of his youth triggered by the French Revolution. The latter, however, were never forgotten by the philosopher who solemnly celebrated the taking of the Bastille on 14 July.

It would be equally pertinent to mention another Hegelian aphorism from the "Fundamentals of Philosophy of the Law" which gives its due to conservatism: "Minerva's owl flies only in darkness." Hegel prefaced it as follows: "Philosophy always comes with its admonitions too late, after the world has already acquired its shape." When philosophy begins to apply its gray color on a gray background, it is proof that a certain form of life has become obsolete and the grayness of philosophy cannot rejuvenate it but only understand it...."

This passage also provoked false reasoning and a depressing effect, particularly Hegel's young students. Michelet, one of them, decided to add to the words of the teacher as follows: "But philosophy is also the predawn crowing of the cock which proclaims the new youth of the world." Michelet submitted his manuscript to Hegel who approved it (see "Hegel in Berichten seiner Zeitgenossen" [Hegel's Report to His Contemporaries], Berlin, 1971, p 331).

Hegel's doctrine is conflicting and subject to conflicting interpretations. Heim described Hegel as the "philosopher of the Restoration," while according to Herzen, "Hegel's philosophy is the algebra of the revolution." What proved viable was the revolutionary materialistic interpretation of Hegel's dialectical method achieved through the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/6

BOOK ABOUT A COMMUNIST'S LIFE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 83 (signed to press 13 Dec 83)
pp 110-113

[Review by A. Zholkver of the book "Iz Moyey Zhizni" [From My Life] by Erich Honecker. Translated from the German. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 367 pp]

[Text] Erich Honecker, SED Central Committee general secretary and GDR State Council chairman, was presented with the Order of Lenin and the Gold Star Medal of Hero of the Soviet Union during the official state visit to the USSR of a GDR party and state delegation in May 1983. In his speech at the presentation ceremony, Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, pointed out that "This high Soviet award is being presented to our dear friend and consistent internationalist for his active participation in the struggle against fascism, outstanding merits in strengthening the fraternal friendship and comprehensive cooperation between the peoples of the GDR and the Soviet Union, and great contribution to the cause of peace and to strengthening the positions of socialism."

More than half a century of Erich Honecker's life has been inseparably linked to the party of the German communists and its struggle for the happiness of the toiling people and the triumph of socialism on German soil. This difficult and stubborn struggle is vividly and convincingly described in his book. His memoirs cover not merely the career of a single individual. It is a book about generations of German communists, their victories and defeats and the triumph of their just cause: the creation of the GDR, the first socialist state on German soil. It is also, in the true meaning of the term, a book about friendship, a story of fraternal cooperation between German and Soviet communists, the SED and the CPSU and the GDR and the Soviet Union.

Erich Honecker's biography is typical of that of many German communists. He was born to a workers family and grew up among hereditary miners and metallurgical workers in the Saar. He became acquainted with the hard life of the working people and their heavy toil since early childhood. Wilhelm Honecker, a miner, had six children and the family was short of everything: bread, milk, clothing and shoes. The only abundant item in the sooty worker settlement was tuberculosis, which took the life of one of Honecker's sisters.

The wealth created by the toil of the miners and metal workers piled up at the other end -- in the villas and safes of the Saar industrialists. Stumme,

the steel magnate, who also owned the metallurgical plant which employed many members of Honecker's family, was the uncrowned king of the entire region. It was thus that since childhood the miner's son became familiar with concepts such as labor, capital, social injustice and inequality. He also learned about other things as well, however, such as the common interests of the working people, their fraternal mutual help and support and their proletarian solidarity. It was not for nothing that Wiebelskirchen, the settlement in which the Honeckers lived, was known as the "red village." In 1912, the year Erich Honecker was born, the social democrats had won the local majority in the elections for the Reichstag. His father and mother and, subsequently, brother and sister, were social democrats and subsequently communists. It was from them that this worker's son, who soon became a roof-maker himself, learned the elements of the political alphabet.

"...During the November revolution and in the postwar revolutionary crisis," Honecker recalls, "my father explained to me in simple terms why was it that the rich were rich and the poor were poor, the reason for wars and who made money or suffered as a result. I acquired a clear idea of what was taking place in the world and decided to dedicate my life to the struggle for peace the world over and socialism. This became my life's objective" (p 13).

"It was at that time," he writes, "that I first heard the name Vladimir Il'ich Lenin. 'We must act like Lenin,' I heard people say at meetings. Both then and later the German communists always tried to act like Lenin" (ibid).

This is described in detail in Honecker's book. The author's life is an example of the way the class battles tempered and led the German workers to communism and Marxism-Leninism. Honecker came to the communist party by following the way taken by thousands of his compatriots. He became a member of a youth communist organization, distributed leaflets and the party press, joined the Spartakus League and subsequently the German Youth Communist League. An event took place during that time which strengthened even further his resolve to become a communist: he heard Ernst Thälmann speak at an all-German meeting in Leipzig. Recalling the event, Honecker writes: "Thälmann, a broad-shouldered stevedore from Hamburg, knew from personal experience not only the hard working conditions of the life of the German proletariat but its will to fight. Better than any other leader of the German working class he enjoyed its infinite trust. His language was the language of workers, simple, clear and intelligible... His words, meaningful and convincing, sounded like a caution and a warning in the face of the serious situation created by the crisis. I remembered particularly clearly his words that in the struggle against exploitation and oppression the Communist Party of Germany is indivisibly linked with the youth" (p 33).

Soon after the Leipzig meeting, another major event took place in the life of this young German communist: his first trip to the country of Lenin. The party and the youth league recommended his enrollment in the Comintern International Leninist School. This occurred in August 1930.

"To this day," Honecker writes, "I well remember the day when, under the light of the rising sun, the train slowly crossed...the Polish-Soviet border. The Polish soldiers with fixed bayonets jumped off the steps of the cars and Red

Army men took their place. To me this event was of tremendous symbolic importance. We had crossed a state border of a very special nature. It was not a usual border between two countries, as for example between the Saar and France or between the Saar and the Reich. No, this was an entirely different border, a border separating two worlds, a border where the power of capital ended and began the power of workers and peasants, a border which could be compared today to the one between the FRG and the GDR...

"Lenin's country literally became the fatherland of all working people. Communists from all parts of the world came here to seek advice and gain new strength and confidence in the revolutionary struggle.

"Lenin's country became my fatherland too, and its party and Komsomol became my own. I saw in the Red Army men who climbed on the steps of the coaches my brothers and comrades, although I did not know them personally. I felt like hugging them and, as is the Russian custom, kissing them, for they represented the country of workers and peasants, and because they were wearing the little red stars on their caps, so similar to the party badge of the CPG. I had loved and been faithful to this star since childhood. It illumined the future" (pp 35-36).

Erich Honecker carried this loyalty to the cause of communism and friendship with the first country of victorious socialism through the many difficulties and trials of a professional revolutionary. Back from the Soviet Union, where he not only studied but also worked on the building of the Magnitka as a member of an international youth brigade, Honecker instantly found himself plunged in the crucible of party activities and sharp political struggle. These were hard times for the German communists. Fascism was raising its head in Germany. In the Saar, which was occupied by French troops after World War One in accordance with the treaty of Versailles, the situation was further complicated by the fact that the movement for the reunification of the Saar with Germany was used by the Hitlerites in their nationalistic and chauvinist propaganda. Correct class positions had to be held under such complex circumstances and the knowledge which the young communist had acquired at the Lenin school in Moscow came in very handy. He shared this knowledge with others. In innumerable talks he described what he had seen in Lenin's country and wrote articles for the workers press.

The communists were calling the toiling people of Germany to struggle, and Erich Honecker participated in that struggle most actively. He not only became the leader of the working youth of the Saar but engaged in broadening clandestine relations with the organizations of the Communist Youth League in the various parts of Germany and subsequently assumed himself the leadership of the district organization in the Ruhr. His activities at that time were extensive and energetic. He distributed the famous book "The Brown Plague on the Burning of the Reichstag and Hitlerite Terrorism," made preparations for the expanded plenum of the German Communist Youth League Central Committee to be held in Amsterdam, attended the European Antifascist Worker Congress in Paris and organized worker demonstrations in the Saar and the Ruhr. The Gestapo increased its surveillance of such a dangerous enemy. In December 1935 Honecker was arrested while receiving a batch of party publications clandestinely shipped from Prague to Berlin.

Erich Honecker remained a communist in the fascist jail as well. He became a member of the clandestine antifascist resistance organization, tried to help his comrades as much as he could and himself used all opportunities to broaden his own outlook. He tried to read as much as possible and to learn from books and contacts with other comrades, inmates in the Brandenburg jail, among whom were the world known singer Ernst Busch and many other noted antifascists.

It was there, in jail, that Erich Honecker learned of the attack by Hitlerite Germany on the Soviet Union. "From the very first day," he recalls, "I firmly believed that the socialist Soviet state will crush the predatory German fascist imperialism. I was profoundly convinced that the Soviet people will never surrender to the aggressor. For as early as 1930-1931, in Moscow and Magnitogorsk, I had become aware of their enthusiasm and creative strength and their indomitable aspiration to surmount even the greatest hardships" (p 93).

The Soviet army liberated the German people themselves from fascism. Erich Honecker was among those who were liberated. In recalling this long-awaited day, he writes: "On the morning of 27 April 1945....the party committee began to free the political prisoners after the jail administration and most guards had escaped to the west.... I hurled myself against the main gates. The guards had already been disarmed. A while later the first Soviet tank approached the gate. I shall never forget the emotion with which we hugged the Soviet soldiers. All of us shamelessly cried as we greeted the Red Army men who had come as liberators and class brothers and friends, opening the way to the new and bright future of mankind.... Like the other concentration camp and jail inmates we, at Brandenburg, swore to uproot fascism and militarism, to build a new antifascists and democratic country and to direct social development on the way to socialism" (p 102-103).

After his release Erich Honecker dedicated his entire strength and energy to this noble objective. He immediately established contacts with the leaders of the German Communist Party, who had returned, and with the Soviet comrades. As early as May 1945, as secretary in charge of youth questions of the CPG Central Committee, he undertook to create an antifascist youth movement. He became the head of the unified antifascist and democratic youth organization -- the Union of Free German Youth.

In the summer of 1947 erich Honecker headed the first delegation of that organization to visit our country. This trip was subsequently described as the "peace mission to the east." The initial contacts between the Soviet and German youth were established in Moscow, Leningrad and Stalingrad.

Meanwhile, major and truly historic changes were taking place in the eastern part of Germany. The age-old division within the German labor movement was eliminated. The Socialist Unity Party of Germany was created and Erich Honecker became one of its youngest leaders. At the age of 38 he was elected candidate member of the SED Central Committee Politburo. The German Democratic Republic was proclaimed in October 1949 and Honecker was a delegate at the National Congress at which this historic resolution was passed.

The members of the youth union were in the front ranks of the builders of the new Germany. They headed the movement of activists in the competition among

working people, sponsored the most important national economic projects, built metallurgical combines and large water reservoirs, created machine-tractor stations and the first agricultural cooperatives, organized youth festivals and raised worker units for the defense of the people's regime. And, as had been the case with their Soviet counterparts of postrevolutionary times, the party gave them the task of learning* Erich Honecker also began to study, once again in the Soviet Union. In August 1945, together with other comrades members of the party and state apparatus and the youth union he was assigned to attend the High Party School of the CPSU Central Committee in Moscow.

"Training," Honecker writes, "meant to us interpreting even more profoundly the laws of social development and the summed up experience in building socialism... Under the guidance of the Soviet instructors and in close contact with comrades from other parties within the global communist movement, we enriched our knowledge and experience" (p 172).

Erich Honecker was to make extensive and fruitful use of this knowledge and experience in the most important positions to which he was assigned by the party and entrusted by the people of the GDR. He became member of the Politburo and secretary of the SED Central Committee in July 1958 and first secretary of the Central Committee in May 1971. He has been general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council since 1976.

The most important stages in the development of the SED and the GDR are inseparably related to Erich Honecker's name: the creation of a national people's army and taking steps to protect the state border of the GDR, the building of a socialist economy and breaching the diplomatic blockade by the German state of workers and peasants, and the drafting of a new party program and republic constitution.

The GDR is a sovereign socialist state. It is one of the 10 industrially most developed countries in the world. It is a member of the UN, CEMA and the Warsaw Pact. At each of the historical stages in the development of the GDR and in all daily practical activities of the party and the state Erich Honecker has emphasized and emphasizes the most important and essential meaning of the fraternal friendship and all-round cooperation with the Soviet Union. "It can be said," we read in his book, "that the history of the GDR is also a history of friendship and increasingly closer cooperation with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries" (p 234).

The visit to the USSR of a GDR party and government delegation was an important landmark in the further development and strengthening of this friendship and cooperation. It took place during the significant period when all progressive mankind was marking the 165th anniversary of Karl Marx's birth.

In one of the final chapters of his book Honecker writes that "In the course of my more than 50 years of struggle in the ranks of the communist movement the attitude toward Lenin's party and the Soviet Union always showed me, as Ernst Thälmann thought, on which side of the barricade to stand. I have always been on the side of the CPSU and the Soviet Union" (p 322).

In his preface to the Russian edition as well, Erich Honecker reemphasizes that he considers the publication of his autobiography in Russian as another opportunity to pay proper due to the relations of close friendship existing between the SED and the CPSU and the GDR and the USSR and between our two peoples.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/6

'CARNATION REVOLUTION' IN PORTUGAL

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 83 (signed to press 13 Dec 83)
pp 113-114

[Review by Jose Freitas, Portuguese journalist, of the book "'Revolyutsiya Gvozdik' v Portugalii" [The "Carnation Revolution" in Portugal] by V. I. Sukhanov. Mysl', Moscow, 1983, 239 pp]

[Text] We, the Portuguese, are naturally interested in the publication abroad of books about our country, and even more so about the 25 April 1974 revolution, known as the "red carnation revolution." V. I. Sukhanov's book, which came out in the Soviet Union is a noteworthy contribution to the studies made by Soviet and other foreign authors on the Portuguese revolution.

The book draws attention to itself above all for its chronological study of the revolutionary events. This allows all readers, including the Portuguese, to understand better all the nuances of its initial stage. It would be no exaggeration to say that this objective documentary story of the "April captains," and the activities of the National Salvation Council, the leaders of the political parties and the parties themselves, splendidly illustrating the entire complexity and diversity of political forces which clashed and continue to oppose each other in the revolutionary struggle, gives the book the attractiveness of a political reportage. At the same time, the study of the reasons for and consequences of the revolutionary events of 1974 (absolutely mandatory in the case of such books), although some readers may consider it excessively detailed, is nevertheless one of the great merits of the work (particularly to experts in the field). In terms of the volume of collected and studied materials this book is a valuable reference work for anyone who has had the opportunity to follow the "carnation revolution." Finally, the compact and precise analysis of the events of our revolution enables us to gain a better understanding of what is happening today in Portugal.

It would hardly be necessary to prove that the revolutionary process in our country, which began on 25 April 1974, is continuing. It has assumed new aspects thanks to the growth of the political consciousness of the broad Portuguese masses which are becoming ever more actively involved in the struggle in the defense of the gains of the April revolution. The most recent meeting of military personnel, in April 1983, at which they expressed their firm intention "to defend the carnation revolution," is yet another of the numerous proofs to the effect that the revolution is alive and growing.

Naturally, it is not developing in a straight line and it is not always following the path most acceptable to the Portuguese working people. Nevertheless, historical experience confirms that any Portuguese government whose foreign and domestic policies conflict with the ideals of the April revolution and, therefore, the interests of the majority of the Portuguese people is, in the final account, doomed to failure. One of the latest confirmations of this fact was the fall of the government which had an absolute majority in parliament, as a result of the struggle waged by the people's masses, and the subsequent electoral defeat of the right-wing forces. The crisis which has long afflicted Portugal can be surmounted only through close unity with the toiling masses and the intensification and development of the April gains. I mention this because the logic of political events, not always apparent on the surface, can be understood only if one is properly familiar with the main social and political forces operating in the country, their intentions and the tactics they use in their political struggle. This is described well and in detail in Sukhanov's book.

The author's analysis of the activities of the Portuguese communists, the history of the PCP, its struggle during the period of clandestinity and after the revolution, particularly emphasizing the role of Alvaro Cunhal, its secretary general, deserves particular attention. For nearly 40 years A. Cunhal, a noted personality in the international communist movement and enthusiastic fighter for the interests of the working people and for peace and socialism, has headed the PCP. "The Soviet communists know you well, dear Comrade Cunhal, as a reliable friend of the party of Lenin and the land of the soviets," reads the congratulations of the CPSU Central Committee to Alvaro Cunhal on the occasion of his recent 70th birthday.

The author convincingly proves how in the course of the country's recent history, starting with the period of Salazar's fascist dictatorship, followed by Caetano, during the period of the struggle for the elimination of fascist structures and for progressive change, relying on Marxist-Leninist doctrine and the principles of proletarian internationalism, the PCP waged a constant struggle for democracy, socialism and peace, both within the country and in the international arena. It made a most important contribution to the specific solution of the problem of decolonization, not to mention the establishment and development of comradely relations between the PCP and the national liberation movements in the former Portuguese colonies during the most difficult period of fascist dictatorship. The communists made invaluable contributions to the most important revolutionary gains such as the agrarian reform, nationalization and worker control of enterprises.

This book will unquestionably trigger a great deal of interest among the specialists and the broad readership circles.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/6

MECHANISM OF IMPERIALIST AGGRESSION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 83 (signed to press 13 Dec 83)
pp 114-118

[Review by Col Gen N. Chervov, candidate of military sciences, of the book "SShA: Voyennaya Mashina i Politika" [United States: Military Machine and Politics] by R. G. Bogdanov. Nauka, Moscow, 1983, 221 pp]

[Text] Izdatel'stvo Nauka has issued a new book by Soviet historian R. G. Bogdanov, who has become known in recent years for his works on topical problems of U.S. foreign policy. This topic is an organic part of the series of studies of the American political mechanism conducted by the USSR Academy of Sciences U.S. and Canada Institute and of the range of works which, as the book's author justifiably notes, have developed into a separate military-political trend in our American studies (see pp 10-11).

Both trends, which are included in the work under review, are topical. At the same time, the work is also a new step in the study of the problems it treats. The book owes its novelty above all to the tremendous documentary data, including previously unused sources, thanks to archive materials discovered recently (in this case this applies not to periodicals or literary materials, which are included in an extensive number of works by Soviet and foreign authors, but to what is known as first-order sources). This feature of the historiographic basis is of substantive rather than formal nature. The new documents are used not to illustrate already familiar concepts but to enable us scientifically to interpret features and aspects of U.S. military policy which were previously no more than subjects of well-founded assumptions.

Furthermore, these documents make it possible to refute Washington's official versions hypocritically concealing the aggressive postulates of American strategy behind references to the "Soviet military threat" and the interests of U.S. "national security."

An even more essential feature of the book is the fact that the entire material used by the author contributes to the successful solution of the research tasks the author has set himself. Their meaning is clearly defined in the very title of the book -- military machine and politics. Naturally, both have been extensively and repeatedly discussed in our literature. In this case, however, we are dealing not merely with the structural components of the mechanism of military policy but with their interconnection; it could

be said that in the narrow meaning of the term such interconnection is the topic of Bogdanov's book. This presumes, first of all, the painting of a complete picture of the phenomenon currently known as the "American military machine" (see p 7). The author describes the lengthy and complex process of the development of this phenomenon. Secondly, the development and substantiation of a concept not reduced to a description of the mechanism of military decision making but exposing the class roots and contents of U.S. military policy are considered within a broad historical framework and brought up to the present.

It is worth noting that such a broad historical approach, which enables us to trace the origins of American nuclear strategy, is important not only from the academic viewpoint. The power of the historical argument is by far not fully used in our propaganda and in exposing imperialist militarism, although it is precisely the history of a problem that can frequently prove the aggressiveness of imperialism more convincingly and completely than information on current events. From this viewpoint the book under review offers scientifically uncontroversial material the value of which is, perhaps, particularly great in terms of the polemics currently under way within the ranks of the world antiwar movement.

The building of the American military machine is presented in the book as the principal instrument in the international policies of U.S. imperialism, whose vicious objectives necessarily demanded precisely such an instrument for their implementation. Despite all sorts of justifying versions aimed at proving the "immemorial peacefulness" of the American bourgeoisie, Bogdanov's book leaves no doubt that the huge U.S. military machine was created by the will of its ruling class and strictly in accordance with the political objectives which monopoly capital set itself. The author traces scrupulously and in detail the way such political objectives guided literally every step in military construction. He also proves that the consistency between these objectives and the means used was enhanced by the fact that the military machine created for the sake of implementing aggressive and expansionistic intentions was never merely a passive instrument. In turn, it exerted an increasing pressure on defining the political course itself, pushing it to the right, in the direction of a thoughtless adventurism.

The foreign policy course of American imperialism is characterized just as clearly. Despite all of its modifications dictated by various specific historical situations, this course, as the author proves, has been determined by profoundly regressive anti-historical concepts of achieving global hegemony by U.S. imperialism, taking class revenge against world socialism and all forces of social progress, including efforts to "throw off" communism and to change the social system in the socialist countries.

Such is in fact, the first topic discussed in the first chapter entitled "Traditions of American Hegemonism and Their Role in Shaping the Theory and Practice of U.S. Militarism." This chapter provides an accurate diagnosis of the chronic or, more precisely, the congenital ailment which afflicts the foreign policy of American imperialism. The dominant feature of its entire ideology and practice in foreign policy, a kind of persistent idea expressed in the notorious slogan "Pax americana," is an aspiration to world domination

and totally unlimited domination of the economics, politics and spiritual life of mankind. This pompous and uncereceremonious slogan means that the entire world must be converted into a gigantic empire ruled by the United States.

The variations and practical attempts to impose this persistent idea, the author says, have been dropped or galvanized one after the other, the moment it would appear to those in power in America that they had sufficient power to restructure the world as it suited them" (p 19).

The historical analysis provided in this chapter clearly indicates the way military power has been granted an increasing share in the arsenal of the variety of means put at the service of this objective. With the appearance of nuclear weapons it gained definitively the upper hand in the thinking of the overseas strategists. The result was that the policy of hegemonism itself assumed an increasingly adventurous nature.

This is particularly noticeable today, when truly new aspects have become apparent in the strategy of the U.S. struggle for world domination, the author notes. This applies to the imperialist camp in which the United States is able to preserve "Atlantic solidarity" at the cost of increasingly heavier pressure on its allies, going as far as the use of diktat, and within the United States itself, where the gravest crisis problems can obviously not be solved through a militaristic pursuit of "world leadership" (see pp 22-23).

The adventurism of the hegemonistic aspirations of the United States stands out in contrast today also because it is opposed by the powerful peace camp headed by the Soviet Union. It is not astonishing that it is opposed by U.S. military-political doctrine and practice, justifiably described as "nuclear madness raised to the rank of state policy" (chapter three).

However obvious this truth may be, its comprehensive and scientifically irrefutable proof and the factually documented exposure of the aggressive plans and actions aimed at preparations for a nuclear catastrophe remain the most important and topical tasks in the ideological and political struggle. Bogdanov's study is a contribution to the solution of this problem.

The author follows step by step the history of the shaping of U.S. nuclear strategy, which was developed from its very beginning as a policy of nuclear blackmail and preparations for waging thermonuclear war on the Soviet Union. Here is a single example: The plan for waging nuclear war against the USSR, code-named "Dropshot," which was revealed recently, was only one of a dozen plans of its kind discussed in the book, the first of which is dated as far back as 1945*. The comprehensive and convincing study of these plans, together with other strategic documents (directives defining such plans, preparatory data related to them and consequent developments) depict a profoundly immoral picture which any sensibly thinking person would find striking: from its very first steps dating back to the end of World War Two (to the period of completion of the work on nuclear weapons) to the present, U.S. nuclear strategy has always proceeded from the concept of being the first to use nuclear weapons. It has always been based on a preventive strike and permanent readiness for unlimited use of nuclear weapons. The numerous modifications made to this strategy over the past 40 years have never questioned its foundations but, conversely, merely sought means of making it more effective.

What was the result of the U.S. atomic monopoly in terms of the world? This is answered by the fact that the United States is the only country to have used nuclear weapons. This fact will not be deleted from the memory of the peoples. Fortunately for all, including the Americans themselves, this monopoly was of short duration. What the United States had succeeded in doing, however, leaves open the question of what it is capable of doing in the final account. This reasonable question reappears today, when Washington is just as stubbornly refusing to follow the example of the Soviet Union and to assume the obligation not to be the first to use a nuclear weapon.

The initial idea, which remains the very foundation of U.S. man-hating military strategy, is the conviction that nuclear weapons must be used for military purposes. In the Pentagon's opinion the key strategic task is preparing for war involving the use of such weapons.

However, realizing that the very fact of possessing an atom bomb has not only military but political aspects, from the very start the American strategists proceeded from the fact that the new weapons would radically and irreversibly change the entire world power balance in favor of the United States and that, furthermore, it is precisely these weapons which would become the decisive criterion in changing this balance. Hence the maniacal idea of preserving overwhelming nuclear superiority at all cost.

Furthermore, the U.S. nuclear strategy continues to proceed from the fact that the Soviet Union is the main target in the nuclear war now being prepared. This, however, has not excluded from Washington's plans the possibility of using nuclear weapons against other countries as well. This concept is confirmed by numerous cases in which the U.S. political and military leaderships have seriously considered such a possibility or else openly threaten to use it.

As to the main objective of American strategy -- war on the USSR -- such a war has always been simply conceived as "preventive," by dealing a first and sudden nuclear strike by the United States, aimed at disarming the Soviet Union without exposing the United States to the threat of nuclear retribution. The Pentagon's strategists have always proceeded from the admissibility and possibility of waging war on foreign soil only (hence the particular reliance on "advanced theater" forces and the illusion of waging a "limited" nuclear war in Europe). Their credo is war which would be fought "as far away from our shores as possible," according to a 1943 statement by J. Forrestal, who was to become the first U.S. secretary of defense, and who ended his life in a mental hospital.

One can only emphasize once again that any type of innovations introduced in U.S. nuclear strategy have been no more than attempts at preserving unchanged precisely the most aggressive and egotistical plans, ignoring the realities of the global strategic balance, and concealing them behind the same references to the "Soviet threat."² Naturally, all of these concepts are concretized in the book in detail. Their detailed study merely confirms that each step taken in the planning of U.S. nuclear strategy is marked by this "legacy of evil."

Equally important is another proof of the conclusion regarding the so-called second dimension in which the author describes U.S. nuclear strategy: the evolution in the ideas and plans for preparations for nuclear war is described in relation to specific steps taken in the field of military construction within the armed forces themselves (Chapter Two: "The Military Machine -- Principal Tool in Postwar Policy Aimed at Achieving Global Domination") and in the political apparatus guiding it (Section Three, Chapter Three: "Nuclear Weapons and Presidential Power," and Chapter Four: "Secretaries of Defense and Politics").

Above all, the U.S. military leadership adopted virtually immediately and totally the stipulation of waging a preventive war on the USSR with nuclear weapons (see the 27 July 1946 letter which Secretary of Defense R. Patterson sent to President Truman, in which "an aggressive program of struggle against the Soviet state is formulated with extreme frankness" (p 68)). The fact of its adoption and permanent retention is confirmed by each subsequent step taken in the field of strategic planning. Thus, one of the many documents confirming this fact -- the 29 October 1953 National Security Council Directive (NSC-162) -- stipulated that the main thing is "the firm resolve of the United States to use its atomic weapons and strike forces for massed retribution" and that "the most reliable defense of the free world is inseparably linked to the deployment of the U.S. armed forces" (pp 90-91).

The strengthening of the already existing aspiration inherent in U.S. foreign policy tradition of resolving political problems through military power, i.e., essentially reducing political to military problems, was an important consequence of this course. Adding to this the fact that the U.S. military leadership was intoxicated by the atomic monopoly (followed by a 20-year nuclear superiority) of the United States, the next step along this way became the aspiration "technologically" to maintain and strengthen this superiority through the qualitative improvement of armaments. This dangerous "reduction" largely helps to explain why the arms race was and remains the pivot of not only the military but, essentially, all international U.S. policy. In the eyes of the U.S. military and political leadership, the author writes, it was precisely the arms race "that became an indicator of the intensiveness of the political struggle waged against the Soviet Union" (p 81).

The huge expansion of the U.S. military machine was the practical manifestation of such concepts. "The postwar level of army, navy and air force construction and its cost reached fantastic dimensions compared to the prewar situation" (p 71). Thus, the author specifies, military expenditures increased a hundredfold compared to prewar times, and by dozens of times after the war alone. The size of the armed forces has increased tenfold compared to the prewar level, and during the last 30 years has not dropped below the 2.2 million level. Most of the forces are deployed in 32 countries, along the virtually entire perimeter of the capitalist world, in the immediate proximity of the borders of the socialist countries. It must be pointed out that this force has been repeatedly used. According to the Brookings Institution, between 1 January 1946 and 31 December 1975 the United States has deployed and used its armed forces to achieve political objectives on 215 occasions. On 19 of these it has threatened the use of nuclear weapons (see p 71).

Matters, however, have not been limited to quantitative growth alone. The concept of "national security" adopted by the United States has presumed a state of permanent military readiness and a global scale of American "interests," or, in other words, an unlimited geographic expansion. This, in turn, required a profound total restructuring of the armed forces. The history of this restructuring and the study of the political consequences of this process are among the most meaningful and interesting parts of the book (Chapter Two, Section Three: "Establishment of a Joint Structure of the Armed Forces and Its Development During the Postwar Period," and Section Four: "Relations Among the Branches of the Armed Forces as a Factor in the Evolution of the U.S. Military Machine"). The author has been able convincingly to describe the way in which gradually and singly the armed forces were reoriented toward foreign expansion, preparation for a first nuclear strike and, in this connection, the increased share of the military leadership and everything developed by the military establishment in defining the general political course (which, along with the military leadership includes significant industrial and academic sectors).

The uninterrupted rivalry among the various arms -- the army, navy, air force and marines -- has played an important role in the intensification and even artificial inflation of the aggressive aspects in the restructuring of the U.S. military machine, for each one of them has vied for assuming the strategic nuclear mission, proving that it is best suited to carry it out. Such an interdepartmental arms race triggered, among others, the concept of the so-called "strategic sufficiency." Its very appearance, which took place as early as the 1950s, already proved that the further growth of the nuclear potential had become a most dangerous nonsense and that the U.S. armed forces are preparing for a destructive war lacking any whatsoever clear idea of its consequences. It is not astounding that as a result of discussions about this concept, the "political leadership" has clearly expressed itself in favor of the unlimited development of precisely strategic weapons without bothering to define the "sufficiency" criterion" (p 100).

The political consequences of the reorganization of the control system of the U.S. armed forces deserve a few words. This has not been merely a question of a tremendous swelling of the military command -- the creation of an entire hierarchy of competing military departments and their quantitative growth (the personnel of the Joint Chiefs of Staff increased from 100 to several thousand people today).

What is far more important is that such reorganizations have sharply increased the role of the military in the government apparatus, including the assumption by it of a number of traditional State Department functions, and reflecting "the process of merging the military with the political leadership of the country" (p 124), in the first place.

In the second place, as the author convincingly proves, is the politically unreliable and sometimes unpredictable nature of the American mechanism of nuclear arms control. On the one hand, he writes, "although the decision to use a nuclear weapon may determine the very existence of the United States as a country, from the American legal point of view it can be made only by the President." What does this mean? Here is an example: In the autumn of 1973

the then President Nixon cynically told congressmen in the White House that "I could go to the next room, pick up a phone, and 25 minutes later 70 million people would die" (p 157). On the other hand the President has the right, theoretically as well as practically, to delegate his prerogatives in this area. There have been precedents of this nature, some of them quite worrisome (see p 163).

There is furthermore a procedure for the implementation of the President's order to use nuclear weapons, which "makes the Pentagon the actual center for giving the order. Some American specialists have expressed their concern that in an emergency situation this could allow the military to exceed its prerogatives concerning the use of nuclear weapons" (p 165). Finally, there is also the coordination of such an order within the NATO framework. Despite NATO consultation agreements a variety of codicils and exceptions practically allow the U.S. President to order the use of nuclear missiles deployed in Western Europe without seeking the allies' opinion (p 169).

All of this provides ample grounds for noting the thoughtless adventurism of the distorted mechanism created by U.S. imperialism in its pursuit of historically doomed objectives of establishing its global hegemony and taking its class revenge through preparations for waging a nuclear war. The nature and modus operandi of this criminal mechanism which threatens the existence of mankind must become familiar not only to the specialists. As Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman has pointed out, "All nations, every person on our planet must be aware of the threatening danger in order to join efforts in the struggle for his own existence."

Any effort consistent with this objective is worthy of attention and support.

FOOTNOTES

1. The author justifiably draws attention also to the fact that this concept has applied and applies to relations between the United States and its NATO allies. The agreement with Britain on parity use of nuclear weapons, made during the war, was denounced during the very first postwar years. Such weapons still remain within the NATO command system within which the United States has retained the monopoly right of their use.
2. The book provides very eloquent data on the cynicism with which this false argument is used in each new step taken in the arms race. Thus, during the 1950s, when the armada of strategic bombers was created under the pretext of "lagging behind the USSR," the claimed number of Soviet airplanes was deliberately inflated by a factor of three or four; during the 1960s, following the start of the mass deployment of ground-based ballistic missiles, the Soviet "missile threat" was exaggerated by a factor of 15-20 (see p 196).

This lie was puffed up with propaganda although the Pentagon had reliable information on the real situation. Furthermore, as American specialists had pointed out, U.S. reaction to the "Soviet threat" had "very little in common with the real intentions of the Russians at any given moment.

Absolutely all shifts in strategy (of the United States -- the author), starting with 1947, coincided least of all with the new actions by the Kremlin. More than anything else they were triggered by the new opportunities which became available to Washington" (pp 79-80).

3. For a long period of time the clear winner in the argument as to "which arm will make a major contribution to achieving world domination" (pp 103-104) was the air force which subsequently shared some strategic nuclear prerogatives with the navy, while the army lost its former dominant status in the armed forces. However, after the adoption of the "flexible reaction" doctrine during the 1960s, these forces, as R. MacNamara, the then secretary of defense, wrote, "had to be properly trained, armed and deployed," which would have enabled them to "wage the entire spectrum of war" (see p 105). The army was assigned the task of "conducting ground combat operations of three kinds: nuclear war, conventional war and counterinsurgency operations" (p 106). This was followed by the shameful failure of American intervention in Vietnam which, however, "did not indicate in the least a rejection of intervention as an instrument of U.S. foreign policy" (ibid). To the contrary, this led to the conclusion that "today military planning can no longer be divided into two sharply different subgroups requiring the respective use of conventional and nuclear weapons" (p 175) and that given the existence of rough military parity the arms race in terms of conventional forces "assumes an even greater strategic significance" (p 107). Therefore, the army even managed to make its contribution to the intensification and broadening of the spectrum of aggressiveness. Furthermore, the author notes, the involvement of the army alongside the police in politics as a repressive apparatus contributed to the general growth of the political influence of the military establishment.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/6

DEPARTMENT OF BLOOD-STAINED AFFAIRS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 83 (signed to press 13 Dec 83)
pp 119-120

[Review by Yuriy Zhukov of the book "Yesli Sorvat' Masku..." [If We Tear Off the Mask...] by F. M. Sergeyev. The real face of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 320 pp]

[Text] "If We Tear Off the Mask..." is the title of the book by F. M. Sergeyev, an international affairs journalist. The official statements by the Washington administration on the purpose and objectives of this agency are truly a mask hiding its real face and the ugly and sinister role which the CIA plays as the principal tool for espionage and subversive activities in which the United States is engaged on a world-wide scale.

This agency of blood-stained affairs was created by President Truman in January 1946, at a time when the ruling U.S. upper crust, intoxicated by its temporary monopoly of nuclear weapons (day-dreaming of eternal monopoly) unceremoniously proclaimed its aim of world domination.

The author reminds us that as early as 1945 Truman confidently claimed that "Victory has entrusted the American people (read the U.S. government -- the reviewer) with the permanent responsibility of leading the world." General Marshall, the then chief of general staff, added that the United States has all the required "power to secure for itself a leading role in the future development of mankind."

Mankind, no less! One J. Petty, an ideologue openly promoting such aggressive intentions, publicly proclaimed that the secret subversive services of the intelligence system being organized at that time were being assigned a most important role in U.S. plans for world rule "by providing world leadership" on all continents and over all social systems."

A great deal has been written on the subject of CIA intrigues. Actually, the notorious "knights of the cloak and dagger," engaged in the performance of dirty subversive operations on the orders of that agency, feel no embarrassment in admitting their base activities as soon as they fulfill their part of the contract. For all it is worth, here is some of their testimony:

William Colby, former CIA director: "Since the end of the war (the World War -- the reviewer) we in the CIA have done nothing but help various....forces in their struggle against the communist menace;"

Ralph (McGeehy), former CIA agent: "The CIA is not and never has been a purely intelligence gathering agency. In reality it is a tool of the President for terrorist operations abroad;"

Wilbur (Eveland), CIA agent for 30 years: "The CIA is an organization with the unaccountable right to interfere in the affairs of other countries;"

Vernon Walters, former CIA director: "A. Letellier (progressive Chilean personality, minister in Allende's government overthrown by the CIA -- the reviewer) was a communist, which justified his assassination."

The merit of the book does not lie in the fact that the author has not limited himself merely to making public sensational fact which expose the "butchers from the Langley foggy bottom," where the CIA is located, but that he has been able to make a profound study of the mechanics of the subversive activities of that agency and bring its techniques to life.

On the basis of numerous foreign studies, using proper arguments and proofs rather than publicity and disinformation disseminated by U.S. and NATO propaganda services, Sergeyev exposes the most frequently used methods with the help of which the CIA tries to destabilize unsuitable regimes in developing countries.

The author makes a thorough study of the biggest actions of this blood-stained agency with the most direct and active participation of which, as we know, conspiracies are made against the governments of other countries, their leaders are assassinated, coups d'etat are made with the help of mercenaries and, should they fail, direct military intervention is used, such as landing of marines and airborne troops, as was the case with the Dominican Republic in April 1965 or quite recently in Grenada. As the author proves with the help of extensive factual data, U.S. subversive activities have been raised to the rank of official policy. The huge "intelligence community" (which includes nine intelligence agencies headed by the CIA) is directly answerable to the President and the National Security Council. Its purpose is to destabilize and overthrow the governments of countries falling within the zone of American "national interests."

Following are some of the blood-covered rungs of the ladder climbed by CIA personnel in carrying out such assignments:

1953: Overthrow of the Iranian government headed by M. Mossadegh, who proved to be undesirable to the American and British oil companies ;

1954: Coup d'etat in Guatemala and overthrow of the Arbenz government undesirable to the United Fruit Company, an American monopoly;

1961: Invasion of Cuba by a gang of mercenaries in the Bay of Pigs area;

1965: Conspiracy against the government of the Dominican Republic and, after its failure, open intervention;

1973: Military-fascist putsch in Chile, assassination of President S. Allende, institution of Pinochet's fascist dictatorship;

1975: Invasion of Angola from Zaire by CIA mercenaries and South African aggression "as a proxy" for the United States ;

1980: Attempt to undermine the socialist system in Poland. Undeclared war on Afghanistan;

1982: Subversive activities against Nicaragua, intervention in El Salvador's internal affairs. Rivers of blood shed in Lebanon as a result of Israeli aggression with most active CIA participation....

The author analyzes in detail and systematically all of these undercover actions of the American subversive services. Characteristically, the style everywhere is the same and the mechanics are standardized*

They start with an unrestrained campaign of slander and complaints to the effect that the country selected as the victim of the prepared conspiracy has allegedly fallen under communist control and threatens the interests of the United States and its allies. Meanwhile the agents sent to that country recruit people who are willing to betray their homeland for profit and the advancement of their careers. They are recruited mainly among officers and generals who have been trained in U.S. and allied military schools. They are generously supplied with money and weapons. If a neighboring country happens to be under U.S. control, gangs are set up and armed there and are subsequently moved into the country whose government Washington has decided to overthrow. It is in accordance with such methods that the masters of "dirty political tricks" in the CIA have carried out many coups d'etat, putting in power most reactionary dictators. For the sake of fairness, however, let us point out that whenever the governments of the countries chosen by the Washington administration as its targets display vigilance and the resolve to defend their independence, such standardized plans suffer a crushing defeat.

Particularly interesting are the chapters on CIA intrigues against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. This is the main line followed in U.S. subversive activities.

As early as August 1950 Washington adopted for execution secret Directive No 68 of the National Security Council, which called for "securing a radical change in the nature of the Soviet system" and sow within our system "the seeds of its own destruction." The directive called for "encouraging and supporting disturbances and mutinies in selected and strategically located neighbors of the Soviet Union.

From that point on a direct thread leads to public statements by President Reagan about a "crusade" against us and his threat to "send the communists to the ash heap of history."

The CIA has done its utmost throughout the entire postwar period to carry out such insane intentions, although even its cleverest plans have suffered one defeat after another. As early as the 1950s, Sergeyev points out, it formulated its secret "REDSOX-REDCAP" plan, the purpose of which was to "disintegrate socialism from within." Every one remembers the stunning defeats of CIA agents, relying on internal counterrevolutionary forces, to overthrow the socialist system in the GDR in 1953, in Hungary in 1956, in Czechoslovakia in 1968 and in Poland today.

The author proves that Washington ascribed particular importance to the efforts to get Poland out of the socialist commonwealth and restore capitalism in that country. On this occasion the White House directly assumed control over subversive activities.

Initially a so called "Polish task force" was set up in Washington, which met on a round-the-clock basis in the White House, under the chairmanship of D. (Scaplan) a high-ranking agent operating under diplomatic cover. Subsequently this was deemed insufficient, and a "special group" was created headed by U.S. Vice President Bush, former head of the CIA. This was a sort of operational headquarters which drafted and implemented steps aimed at helping the forces of the Polish counterrevolution in the struggle against the legitimate authorities. This "special group" included the secretary of state, the secretary of defense, members of the National Security Council and the President's office and, naturally, the director of the CIA.

All of these efforts proved futile in the face of the firm resolve to defend their revolutionary gains shown by the Polish patriots, who relied on the support of the fraternal members of the socialist commonwealth.

Izdatel'stvo Politicheskoy Literatury is doing a great job with the publication of a series of books which expose the crimes of American imperialism and particularly the insidious actions of the CIA, the main tool in its subversive activities. F. M. Sergeyev's book occupies a suitable place in the series of such works which call for vigilance.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/6

INDEX OF ARTICLES AND MATERIALS PUBLISHED IN KOMMUNIST IN 1983

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 83 (signed to press 13 Dec 83)
pp 121-128

[Text]

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
New Documents by Karl Marx	3	3	1
New Document of Karl Marx	5	3	1
Sixty Years of USSR (Yu. V. Andropov)	1	3	1
To the Parliaments, Governments, Political Parties and Peoples of the World	1	16	15
Yu. V. Andropov's Answers to Questions Put by American Columnist Joseph Kingsbury-Smith	1	18	17
Yu. V. Andropov's Answer to a Question Put by the Newspaper RUDE PRAVO	1	20	19
In the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and USSR Council of Ministers	1	21	21
Karl Marx's Teachings and Some Questions of Building Socialism in the USSR (Yu. V. Andropov)	3	9	10
Andropov's Answers to Questions Asked by a PRAVDA Correspondent	3	32	35
Yu. V. Andropov's Answers to Questions by a PRAVDA Correspondent	5	10	10
Eightieth Anniversary of the Second RSDWP Congress ...	6	3	1
Speech by Yu. V. Andropov	7	3	1

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Yu. V. Andropov's Answers to DER SPIEGEL Magazine (FRG)	7	7	6
Yu. V. Andropov's Answer to the Appeal of a Group of American Scientists and Public Personalities	7	16	17
Yu. V. Andropov's Answer to the Appeal of the Heads of States and Governments of Austria, Cyprus, San Marino, Finland, Sweden and Yugoslavia	7	18	19
Yu. V. Andropov's Answers to Questions by Representatives of Several Finnish Public Organizations	8	3	1
Information Report on CPSU Central Committee Plenum ..	9	3	1
Speech by Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee General Secretary	9	4	3
Topical Questions of the Party's Ideological and Mass-Political Work (K. U. Chernenko)	9	17	18
Topical Problems of Party Ideological and Mass- Political Work	9	39	45
K. U. Chernenko's Address	9	47	54
USSR Supreme Soviet Decree on the Election of Comrade Andropov, Yu. V., USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Chairman	9	48	56
Yu. V. Andropov's Speech	9	48	57
To Preserve and Multiply Detente Achievements (Yu. V. Andropov)	10	15	15
Always in Formation	13	4	1
Speech by Comrade Yu. V. Andropov	13	4	2
Introductory Speech by M. S. Gorbachev	13	9	8
Speeches by Participants in the Meeting	13	9	9
Meeting With Party Veterans at the CPSU Central Committee	13	17	19

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
At the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers	13	19	21
Yu. V. Andropov's Answers to PRAVDA Questions	13	24	27
To a Group of Social Democratic Deputies of the FRG Bundestag (Yu. V. Andropov)	14	13	12
Statement by Yu. V. Andropov, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium	15	13	12
Yu. V. Andropov Replies to Questions from the Newspaper PRAVDA	16	13	12
Statement by Yu. V. Andropov, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium	18	3	1
Editorials and Editorial Articles			
We Are Proud of Our Homeland	2	3	1
Loyalty to Lenin's Foreign Policy Course	3	24	26
The Pivot of the Entire Economic Construction	4	3	1
The Leninist Ethics of Bolshevism	6	58	65
Ideological Work--On the Level of the Tasks of Perfecting Developed Socialism	10	3	1
In the Major Areas of Our Work	11	3	1
Peace, the Working Class and the Communists	12	19	19
Labor Collective and Discipline	14	3	1
October Revolution and World Development	15	3	1
Our Strength Lies in Unity	16	3	1
High Responsibility of Criticism	18	43	48

Father of Scientific Communism

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Karl Marx: "Philistines Are Marching On Me" (G. Volkov)	4	29	32
Powerful Weapon of Scientific Cognition and Revolutionary Action (A. Yegorov)	5	14	14
Karl Marx and the Universal-Historical Process of the Liberation of Man (V. Zagladin, S. Men'shikov and I. Frolov) ..	6	33	35
Marx Is Always Contemporary (R. Kosalapov)	7	19	20
Karl Marx and India's Rebirth (Hiren Mukerjee)	16	27	28
Karl Marx and Fundamental Questions of Aesthetics (M. Ovsyannikov)	12	30	31
Always To Learn From Marx (Ezekias Papaioannou)	15	35	37
Place of Hired Labor in Marx's Theory and Today's Working Class (E. Pletnev)	17	33	35
Rare Edition of Karl Marx's Biography	13	28	31
The Problem of Ownership in Marx's Economic Theory (M. Sakov)	4	15	15
Marx's Theory and Bourgeois Falsifications (F. Teplov)	18	7	5
Marx and the Experience of the First Proletarian Revolution (N. Fedorovskiy)	11	14	13
Karl Marx and Social Development in Russia (G. Fridlender)	10	31	32
Karl Marx and the Contemporary Revolutionary Movement (Gus Hall)	14	15	15

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Most Valuable Spiritual Asset of Mankind	8	6	5
Our Knowledge, Strength and Weapons			
V. I. Lenin and the Foreign Policy of the Soviet State (A. Gromyko)	6	11	10
V. I. Lenin on the Relationship Between Politics and Reality (A. Titarenko)	11	23	23
V. I. Lenin: "These Are the Lofty Tasks of Which I Am Dreaming..." (V. Chikin)	6	48	53
The Eightieth Anniversary of the Second RSDWP Congress			
Marxist Doctrine of the Party and Bolshevism (Ye. Bugayev)	10	43	46
Preparing for an Important Anniversary (V. Grishin)	9	49	58
A Party of Revolutionary Action (M. V. Zimyanin)	12	3	1
Victorious Record of Battle and Construction (Boris Ponomarev)	9	61	73
Congress That Completed the Founding of the Party (A. Solov'yev)	11	45	48
Beginning of Bolshevism (K. Tarnovskiy)	11	34	36
26th CPSU Congress--Development of Marxist-Leninist Theory			
Theoretical Problems of the Economic Mechanism (L. Abalkin)	14	28	30
Labor Productivity: Theory, Practice, Growth Reserves (A. Bagdasarov)	2	14	14

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Components of Social Justice			
(V. Davidovich)	5	47	53
Socialist Production Efficiency: A Variant of Political Economic Analysis			
(Yu. Ivanov)	14	39	42
Cardinal Principle of Socialist Direct Social Production			
(V. Mazur)	2	24	25
Basic Economic Law of Socialism and the Conversion of Labor Into a Prime Vital Need			
(A. Melent'yev)	2	37	39
Scientific and Technical Progress and Transformations in the Sphere of Labor			
(B. Rakitskiy)	5	35	40
Theory and Practice of Party Construction			
Moscow State University Party Conference			
(V. Arkhipenko)	18	19	20
Growing Role of Labor Collectives			
(Yu. Balandin)	7	64	71
Party Decision and Its Efficacy			
(I. Bondarenko)	7	43	48
With An Accurate Understanding of the Situation			
(K. Vayno)	4	51	62
Efficiency in Party Work			
(V. Dobrik)	7	54	60
Strict Talk			
(V. Kadulin)	15	58	63
Primary Party Organizations and Strengthening of Party Ranks			
(G. Kryuchkov)	15	46	49
Intraparty Democracy in Action			
(D. Kunayev)	16	16	16

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Effect of an Initiative (V. Petrov)	16	35	37
Party Committees and the Strengthening of Discipline (P. Fedirko)	4	40	50
Control and Verification--The Most Important Functions of Party Guidance (V. Shcherbitskiy)	10	17	17
All-Party Cause			
"...Ability To Inspire the Energy, Heroism and Enthusiasm of the Masses..." (M. Gabdulín)	17	43	46
Work: The Main Sculptor of the Personality	9	85	101
Improving the Workstyle (B. yel'tsin)	11	56	61
In Harmony With Practice (P. Matveyev)	11	69	75
Management Presupposes Education (Ye. Sizenko)	3	33	37
Ideological Work is the Most Important Means of Strengthening Ties Between the Party and the Masses (T. Usubaliyev)	17	54	59
June Plenum Ideological Work Decisions Discussed (K. Chernenko)	15	18	17
We Are Proud of Our Fatherland			
Man on Earth (N. Aliyev)	1	31	34
The Way It Was (P. Voronova)	1	23	23
Call of the Heart (Khamid Gulyam)	1	37	41

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Priceless Possession (S. Nekorysnov)	1	43	50
A Fixture of Our Life (E. Paap)	1	27	29
On the Positions of the 11th Five-Year Plan			
Automotive Transport: Further Development Tasks (D. Velikanov)	15	70	77
Incentives for Innovation (L. Gol'din)	16	47	51
Capital Construction Under the Conditions of Inten- sification and the Financial-Credit Mechanism	12	41	43
On the Political Approach to Economics (P. Ignatovskiy)	12	60	64
On the Main Direction (V. Kabaidze)	6	68	76
Attention to and Concern for the Members of the Labor Collective (V. Kuznetsov, V. Tonkonog, V. Belen'kiy) ...	8	47	52
Scientific and Technical Progress is the Basis for Social Production Intensification (G. Marchuk)	4	61	74
Terrestrial Cosmonautics Program (V. Mishin)	6	80	90
In the Interests of the Present and Future Generations (Z. Nuriyev)	15	80	87
Bank Credit: Economic Incentives and Levers (V. Rybin)	12	53	56
Developing the Democratic Principles in Managing Production (Ye. Torkanovskiy)	8	36	40
Valuable Muscovite Experience	3	44	50

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Fulfilling a Challenging Plan (N. Chikirev)	8	24	27
The Main Task of the Five-Year Plan			
Sectorial Contribution of the Food Program (S. Antonov)	4	73	88
The USSR Food Program--A New Stage in the Party's Modern Agrarian Policy (K. Bogolyubov)	13	33	37
Tasks of Agricultural Science in the Implementation of the Food Program (V. Vavilov)	9	73	87
Collective Contract in the Countryside (A. Iyevlev)	13	47	54
Efficiency in Management (V. Kovalenko)	10	57	63
Growing Wings; Notes From a Rural Rayon (B. Tulunin)	10	67	74
Science, Culture, Life			
Latest Tasks of Soviet Geography (N. Agafonov, V. Anuchin, S. Lavrov)	5	65	73
Ethnic Processes in the USSR (Yu. Bromley)	5	56	63
Crucial Tasks of Socialist Culture (P. Demichev)	17	20	20
Pages From the Struggle			
From P. L. Lavrov's Files	13	86	98
G. V. Plekhanov's Ideological-Theoretical Activities and the Emancipation of Labor Group (M. Iovchuk)	14	50	54

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Marx's Great Contemporary: Chernyshevskiy, His Time and Revolutionary Accomplishments (R. Konyushaya)	13	75	86
Centennial of the Emancipation of Labor Group	13	94	112
Sevastopol: Thrice Born (N. Proskuryakov)	9	97	116
For Our Soviet Homeland			
Shlissel'burg-Sinyavino Salient (V. Achkasov, A. Basov)	2	67	78
Great Victory in the Kursk Arc (S. Ivanov)	11	77	84
Russia's Tested Shield (Yu. Konishchev)	13	100	122
Victory on the Volga (D. Lelyushenko)	1	77	89
Battle for the Dnepr (K. Moskalenko)	16	59	64
New Patriotic War Documents	2	49	51
New Documents of the Patriotic War	10	78	87
New Patriotic War Documents	15	90	98
Features of an Immortal Exploit (Ivan Paderin)	1	89	110
Guarding the Gains of October (V. Tolubko)	3	55	63
Friendship Stronger Than Armor (M. Shtefanko)	3	67	77
Zealous Fighters for Communism			
Vigorous Fighter of Lenin's Guard (D. Antonyuk)	17	65	71

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Worker's Deputy (V. Arkhipenko)	16	70	78
Consistent Internationalist (S. Belenkov)	5	84	94
Outstanding Revolutionary and Thinker (V. Bogorad)	5	91	102
Remarkable Son of the British Working Class (V. Zaytsev)	16	80	90
Mobilized and Drafted by the Revolution (A. Metchenko)	9	104	124
From the Experience of the Socialist Commonwealth			
Spirited Assistant of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party (Ye. Bavrin and A. Taksabayev)	14	62	68
CEMA: Economic Strategy for the Eighties (O. Bogomolov)	7	73	82
New Levels of Cooperation Among CEMA-Member Countries (A. Bykov)	18	52	58
From Our Experience (Stanislaw Wroncki)	12	83	90
Laos: The Maturing of the Revolution (V. Kadulin)	6	91	102
New Agreement Tested by Life (V. Kuz'min and R. Lozhnikov)	18	63	71
International Policy of Socialism: Unity of Word and Deed	8	56	62
Important Milestone in the History of Soviet- Vietnamese Relations (Ye. Pavlov)	15	102	115
Memorandum on the Proceeding of the International Conference of Editors in Chief of Theoretical and Political Journals of Fraternal Communist and Work Parties	4	85	102

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Article in the Journal NOWE DROGI	7	85	96
Revolutionary Behest of the Victorious February 1948 (Milos Jakes)	3	70	81

Under the Banner of Internationalism

We Believe in Proletarian Internationalism (Gordon Andersen)	2	78	90
First Victory Over Fascism (Ernst Henry)	18	69	78
Communists' International Rostrum	12	73	79
Soviet Experience and Canadian Reality (William Kashtan)	1	58	66
Party of Patriots and Internationalists (Alvaro Cunhal)	16	87	98
New Chapter in Mankind's History (Gyorgy Lazar)	1	48	55
Anticolonialism's Difficult Road (R. Mosebitse)	13	58	67
Festival of Friendship and Peace (Gastone Pasolini)	1	65	74
Again the Curtain Rises in Front of Latin America (Manuel Sepeda)	1	68	78
Why I Am a Communist, Why I am the Soviet Union's Friend (Mikis Theodorakis)	1	51	58
Program of the Austrian Communist Party (Erwin Scharf)	3	82	94

Labor and Capital

Proletariat Facing the Onslaught of the Monopolies (A. Galkin)	7	74	81
---	---	----	----

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Society of Mass Unemployment: Scale, Causes, Consequences (Yu. Shishkov)	17	103	93
In Defense of the Living Standards and Rights of the Working People (Akira Iwai)	17	96	113
Tragedy of Millions; Sociological Consequences of Unemployment in the FRG (N. Izvolenskaya)	17	85	105
Realities of Our Time			
Outer Space Must Be Peaceful (V. Avduyevskiy)	15	108	122
Nonaligned Movement at an Important Stage (Yu. Alimov)	7	99	113
Changing Structure of the Finnish Society (Gunnar Asplund)	2	83	95
Ink Coolies of American "Sovietology" (A. Belyayev)	8	77	87
Real Source of Threat to Peace (V. Bogdanov, A. Podberezkin)	10	94	113
Campaign Against...Everybody (S. Vishnevskiy, V. Kobyshev)	4	88	106
Antimonopoly Potential of the New Social Movements (Willi Gerns)	11	103	117
USSR in the Vanguard of the Struggle for Human Rights (Yu. Deporov)	18	78	89
Invincible Force (Yu. Zhukov)	7	89	101
Kampuchea: The Miracle of Survival (V. Kadulin)	11	89	98
Crime From the Past to the Present (I. Karpets)	8	86	97

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
To Know and Understand Each Other Better (Z. Kruglova)	1	99	131
Whither Japan? (Yu. Kuznetsov)	4	98	118
FCP: Challenge to the Capitalist Crisis (Georges Marchais)	1	111	144
"Social Partnership" or Paltry Handouts (I. Mel'nikov)	8	68	77
Fifty Years of Many Difficulties (Yu. Molchanov)	16	106	120
Year 1983: Most Important Trends in International Development (Yu. Molchanov and V. Nekrasov)	18	96	108
Grenada--Victim of U.S. Imperialist Aggression (D. Murav'yev)	16	109	125
Dynamics of Peaceful Offensive (V. Nekrasov)	8	66	74
What Is Behind "Western Solidarity?" (V. Nekrasov)	13	63	73
Teheran's Historic Lessons (V. Nekrasov)	17	110	120
Counterrevolution for Export (V. Nikolayev)	12	113	124
Attention, "Hawks!" (R. Ovinnikov)	2	94	108
The Contemporary Situation and the Role of the Democratic Press (B. Ponomarev)	17	3	1
Bourgeois Culture Riding the Crest of Neoconservatism (K. Razlogov)	3	94	107
In the Interests of Peace and Cooperation in Europe (Yu. Rakhmaninov)	16	97	110

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
"Psychopolitics" and What It Conceals (S. Roshchin)	12	102	112
Important Factor of Peace (V. Sobakin, V. Shaposhnikov)	12	93	102
Plans and Deeds of Newfangled "Crusaders" (L. Tolkunov)	6	103	117
Communist Party of Greece Stands for Fundamental Changes (Grigoris Faracos)	18	89	97
There Is No More Important Task Than That of Preventing War (P. Fedoseyev)	14	69	76
Realistic Program for Curbing the Arms Race (A. Chernyshev)	5	101	113
Global Programs and the Developing World (N. Shmelev)	14	83	93

From the Editor's Mail

Deep Traditions of Kinship and Friendship (D. Likhachev)	11	118	139
Heine Was Right (A. Gulyga)	18	108	128
Does This Represent a Development of the Marxist- Leninist Theory of Contradiction? (S. Dudel')	7	111	126
Guard of the Eternally Young (Aleksandr Il'chenko)	3	105	120
A Party Committee Studies Public Opinion (V. Korobeynikov)	12	122	138
Controlling the Competition Proces (O. Kosenko)	14	100	112
Use of Power (A. Kuz'minykh)	2	107	124

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
F. E. Dzerzhinskiy and the Establishment of a Planned Economy (O. Latsis)	13	112	136
Example of Scientific Irresponsibility (V. Muradyan, Yu. Pankov and Sh. Chivadze) ..	8	115	133
Work--Duty and Obligation (L. Odinkova)	2	105	120
On the Subject of a Book (R. Petropavlovskiy)	8	102	119
Journal's Mail: July-December 1982	2	123	150
Journal's Mail: January-June 1983	11	122	146
Managerial Responsibility for End Results (S. Protserov)	7	117	137
For the Sake of a Bountiful Harvest (S. Radchenko)	14	95	106
Has the Category of Essentiality Been Elaborated in Marxism? (G. Sadovskiy)	7	115	134
Comprehensive Approach in Reducing Manual Labor	12	115	127
Urban Resource Utilization Standards (T. Sudadze)	3	108	127
On Teaching Scientific Communism in VUZs (V. Fetisov)	4	110	130
After All, Who Is the Frontranker? On Competition Conditions and Criteria (V. Cherfas)	5	76	85

Following the KOMMUNIST Publication

Sectorial Management of Industry (K. Belyak)	8	94	106
"Biological and Social Inheritance"	14	104	118

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Realistic Suggestion (A. Petros'yants)	8	100	116
"Light and Grain"	14	112	131
"Bread Is the Staff of Life"	2	110	128

Criticism and Bibliography

Aleksandrov, V.--Problems of Detente in Works by Soviet Scientists ("Istoriya Vneshney Politiki SSSR. 1917-1980 gg." [History of the USSR Foreign Policy, 1917-1980] in 2 volumes, vol 2, 1945-1980; "Bor'ba Sotsialisticheskogo Sodruzhestva za Razryadku Mezhdunarodnoy Napryazhennosti" [The Struggle of the Socialist Comity for Detente] by A. V. Vakhrameyev; "Problemy Voennoy Razryadki" [Problems of Military Detente]; "Razryadka Mezhdunarodnoy Napryazhennosti i Ideologicheskaya Bor'ba" [Detente and Ideological Struggle]; "Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya i Bor'ba Idey" [International Relations and the Struggle of Ideas]; "Razryadka Protiv Antirazryadki. Nekotoryye Voprosy Bor'by Kps Protiv Podryva Razryadki Agressivnymi Silami" [Detente Against Anti-Detente. Some Problems of the Struggle Waged by the CPSU Against the Undermining of Detente by Aggressive Forces])	2	118	142
Andreyev, V.--At the Sources of a Young Scientific Trend ("Ekonomika Prirodopol'zovaniya" [The Economics of the Use of Nature] by T. S. Khachaturov)	16	120	145
Arkhipov, B.--Raising Convinced Patriots- Internationalists (KOMMUNIST UKRAINY, UZBEKISTON KOMMUNISTI (KOMMUNIST UZBEKISTANA), AZERBAYDZHAN KOMMUNISTI (KOMMUNIST AZERBAYDZHANA), SAKARTVELOS KOMUNISTI (KOMMUNIST GRUZII), KOMUNISTAS (KOMMUNIST, Lithuania), KOMUNISTUL MOLDOVEY (KOMMUNIST MOLDAVII), PADOM'YU LATVIYS KOMUNISTS (KOMMUNIST SOVETSKOY LATVII), EESTI KOMMUNIST (KOMMUNIST ESTONII), and TATARSTAN KOMMUNISTY (KOMMUNIST TATARII), KOMMUNIST BELORUSSII,			

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
KAZAKHSTAN KOMMUNISTI (KOMMUNIST KAZAKHSTANA), KOMMUNIST (Kirghizia), KOMMUNISTI TOCHIKISTON (KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA), TURKMENISTAN KOMMUNISTI (KOMMUNIST TURKMENISTANA) and LENINYAN UGIOV ("Along Lenin's Way, Armenia) 3	3	112	132
Burov, V.--Sociophilosophical Problems of Developing Countries ("Sotsial'no-Kul'turnyye Traditsii i Obshchestvennoye Soznaniye v Razvivayushchikhsya Stranakh Azii i Afriki" [Sociocultural Traditions and Social Consciousness in Developing Asian and African Countries] by B. S. Yerasov; "Sotsial'no- Filosofskiye Problemy Obshchestvennogo Razvitiya" [Sociophilosophical Problems of Social Development] by Yu. M. Pavlov; "Sotsial'noye Obnovleniye: Skhemy i Real'nost' [Social Renovation: Plans and Reality] by B. S. Starostin; "Levoradikal'naya Sotsiologiya v Latinskoy Amerike. Kritika Osnovnykh Kontseptsiy" [Left-Radical Sociology in Latin America. Critique of Basic Concepts] by A. V. Shestopal) 15	15	123	141
Bushuyev, V.--Main Motive and Mobilizing Force of the Revolutionary Struggle ("Mezhdunarodnoye Rabocheye Dvizheniye. Voprosy Istorii i Teorii" [The International Worker Movement. Problems of History and Theory] by B. N. Ponomarev; "Rabocheye Dvizheniye Razvitykh Kapitalisticheskikh Stran Posle Vtoroy Mirovoy Voyny (1945-1979)" [The Worker Movement in the Developed Capitalist Countries After World War Two (1945-1979)]) 16	16	112	130
Vaganov, F.--Basic Work on the History of the Working Class in Russia ("Istoriya Rabochego Klassa SSSR. Rabochiy Klass Rossii ot Zarozhdeniya do Nachala XX v." [History of the USSR Working Class. The Working Class in Russia From Its Inception to the Beginning of the 20th Century]) ... 12	12	126	145
Vekua, G.--Creative Approach to Philosophical Problems in Medicine ("Metodologicheskiye i Sotsial'nyye Problemy Meditsiny i Biologii. Sbornik Nauchnykh Trudov" [Methodological and Social Problems in Medicine and Biology. Collection of Scientific Works; "Determinizm i Teoriya Prichinnosti v Patologii" [Determinism			

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
and the Theory of Causality in Pathology] by V. P. Petlenko, A. I. Strukov and O. K. Khmel'nitskiy; "Filosofskiye Aspekty Gerontologii" [The Philosophical Aspects of Gerontology] by T. V. Karsayevskaya and A. T. Shatalov; "Filosofiya Meditsiny" [Philosophy of Medicine] by V. P. Petlenko and G. I. Tsaregorodtsev; "Sotsial'naya Determinirovannost' Biologii Cheloveka" [Social Determinism in Human Biology] by K. Ye. Tarasov and Ye. K. Chernenko; "Dialektika i Teoriya Meditsiny [Dialectics and Theory of Medicine] by A. A. Korol'kov; "Chelovek kak Predmet Filosofskogo i Yestestvenno-Nauchnogo Poznaniya" [Man as Subject of Philosophical and Natural Science Study] by V. F. Serzhantov and V. V. Grechanyy; "Filosofskiye Problemy Meditsiny (Beseda s Uchenymi. Otvety na Pis'ma Chitateley)" [Philosophical Problems in Medicine (Conversation with Scientists. Answers to Letters to the Editor)]; "Gnoseologicheskiye Problemy Prichinnosti v Meditsine" [Gnoseological Problems of Causality in Medicine] by V. G. Yerokhin 7 123 148	7	123	148
Volkov, G. --Science and Technology--for the People ..	7	119	140
Golobokov, V.--Dialectics: Creative Legacy and Creative Search ("Materialisticheskaya Dialektika kak Obshchaya Teoriya Razvitiya" [Dialectical Materialism As a General Theory of Development], Book I, "Philosophical Foundations of the Theory of Development," Book II; "Materialisticheskaya Dialektika [Dialectical Materialism], Volume I, "Objective Dialectics," Volume II, "Subjective Dialectics") 9 116 138	9	116	138
Golyakov, S.--CIA and Western Europe ("Gryaznaya Rabota TsRU v Zapadnoy Yevrope" [CIA's Dirty Work in Western Europe]) 5 125 144	5	125	144
Gorskiy, A., and Udal'tsova, Z.--Book on Ancient Rus' ("Kievskaya Rus' i Russkiye Knyazhestva XII-XIII Vv." [Kiev Rus' and the Russian Principalities in the 12th and 13 Centuries]) 3 123 152	3	123	152

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Teyev, A.--History of Sociology and Ideological Struggle ("Istoriya Burzhuaznoy Sotsiologii XIX-Nachala XX Veka" [History of Bourgeois Sociology of the 19th and Beginning of the 20th Centuries]; "Istoriya Burzhuaznoy Sotsiologii Pervoy Poloviny XX Veka" [History of Bourgeois Sociology During the First Half of the 20th Century]; "Burzhuaznaya Sotsiologicheskaya Teoriya" [Bourgeois Sociological Theory] by I. I. Antonovich)	6	126	150
Suslov, M. A.--True Documents of the Time ("Marksizm--Leninizm i Sovremennaya Epokha" [Marxism-Leninism and the Contemporary Stage]	8	117	136
Yevstigneyev, R.--Perfecting Planned Management in the Socialist Countries ("Kollektivnyy Opyt Sovershenstvovaniya Upravleniya Sotsialisticheskoy Ekonomikoy (po Materialam S'yездov Kommunisticheskikh i Rabochikh Partiy)" [Collective Experience in Perfecting Socialist Economic Management (Based on the Experience of Communist and Worker Party Congresses)])	15	121	138
Yermoshkin, N.--Imperialism Against the Liberated Countries ("The World Economic and Social Crisis. Its Impact on the Underdeveloped Countries, Its Somber Prospects and the Need To Struggle If We Are To Survive," by Fidel Castro)	10	123	157
Zholkver, A.--Book About a Communist's Life ("Iz Moyey Zhizni" [From My Life] by Erich Honecker)	18	110	131
Zhukov, Yuriy--Department of Blood-Stained Affairs ("Yesli Sorvat' Masku..." [If We Tear Off the Mask...] by F. M. Sergeyev)	18	119	147
Ignatovskiy, V.--Policy of Aggression and Piracy ("Krovavye Sledy Amerikanskogo Imperializma" [The Blood-Stained Tracks of American Imperialism])	4	125	156
Idashkin, Yu., and Stel'makov, Yu.--Combat Publicism ("Literatura, Politika, Zhizn'" [Literature, Politics, Life] by Aleksandr Chakovskiy)	11	116	135

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Iovchuk, M.--On the Path to Full Social Equality ("Stanovleniye Sotsial'noy Odnorodnosti" [Establishment of Social Homogeneity] by M. N. Rutkevich)	1	124	159
Iovchuk, S., and Shirayev, Yu.--Comprehensive Study of Foreign Economic Relations of Developing Countries ("Mezhdunarodnyye Ekonomicheskiye Otnosheniya Razvivayushchikhsya Stran" [International Economic Relations of Developing Countries])	5	120	136
Kalinkin, V.--Review of the Journal MOLODOY KOMMUNIST	17	122	132
Kodukhov, V.--Russian Language and Linguistic Theory ("Russkiy Yazyk. Entsiklopediya" [The Russian Language. Encyclopedia]; "Istoki i Sud'by Russkogo Literaturnogo Yazyka" [Origins and Destiny of the Russian Literary Language]; "Ocherki po Teorii Yazykoznaniya" [Essays on the Theory of Linguistics])	4	120	147
Unattributed--Fundamental Issue of Party Work ("Utverzhdai' Leninskiy Stil' v Partiyonoy Rabote" [Asserting the Leninist Style in Party Work] by K. U. Chernenko)	6	118	136
Krasovskiy, V.--Technical Progress and Reserves in the Construction Complex ("Ekonomika Stroitel'stva na Novom Etape" [New Stage in Construction Economics] by I. N. Dmitriyev, P. B. Antonevich, B. S. Bushuyev, I. A. Bystrov, V. P. Kolosov, I. K. Komarov, A. I. Mitrofanov, P. D. Podshivalenko, N. I. Prikshaytis, A. F. Rumyantsev and I. A. Sukhachev)	9	125	153
Krotov, F.--Internationalists of the October School ("Iskry Velikogo Oktyabrya" [Sparks of the Great October])	15	119	134
Likhachev, D.--Deep Traditions of Kinship and Friendship ("Drevnerusskoye Naslediye i Istoricheskiye Sud'by Vostochnogo Slavyanstva" [Ancient Russian Legacy and Historical Destinies of the Eastern Slavs] by V. T. Pashuto, B. N. Florya and A. L. Khoroshkevich)	11	118	139

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Mel'nikova, I.--On the Path Laid by the Great October ("Velikiy Oktyabr' i Revolyutsii 40-kh Godov v Stranakh Tsentral'noy i Yugo Vostochnoy Yevropy" [The Great October and the Revolutions in Central and Southeastern Europe in the 1940s]	16	119	142
Morekhina, G.--Role of the CPSU in the Ideological Victory Over Fascism ("Ideologicheskaya Pobeda Nad Fashizmom (1941-1945 Gg.)" [The Ideological Victory Over Fascism (1941-1945)] by N. I. Kondakova)	4	118	144
Moskovchenko, N.--Material Prerequisites for the Social Homogeneity of the Socialist Society ("Ekonomicheskiye Osnovy Sotsial'noy Odnorodnosti Obshchestva" [Economic Foundations of the Social Homogeneity of Society] by V. V. Tsakunov; "Problemy Sotsialisticheskogo Obraza Zhizni" [Problems of the Socialist Way of Life]; "Effektivnost' Obobshchestvleniya Sotsialisticheskogo Truda" [Effectiveness of the Socialization of Socialist Labor] by V. M. Kuznetsov)	5	114	126
Naletov, I.--Historical Lessons From a Philosophical Debate ("Boy Absolyutno Neizbezhen" [A Totally Inevitable Battle] by A. I. Volodin)	2	116	138
Unsigned--Along the Paths of Improving Developed Socialism and the Struggle for the Consolidation of Peace ("Izbrannyye Rech'i i Stat'i [Selected Speeches and Articles] by Yu. V. Andropov)	13	121	151
Ozerov, V.--For a Party Literature ("Zhivaya Sila Leninskikh Idey" [The Living Force of Lenin's Ideas] by I. S. Chernoutsan)	6	124	147
Ostroumov, G.--Leninist Foundations of the Organization of the State of the Whole People ("Konstitutsionnyye Osnovy Organizatsii Sovetskogo Obshchenarodnogo Gosudarstva" [The Constitutional Foundations of the Organization of the Soviet State of the Whole People] by N. P. Farberov)	6	122	143

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Belous, N.--Publicists' Quest ("Tayna Marukhskogo Lednika" [The Secret of the Marukhskiy Glacier] by Vladimir G. Gneushev and Andrey L. Poput'ko; and Satarin, I. ("Afganistan. Molodost' Revolyutsii" [Afghanistan. The Youth of the Revolution] by Ivan M. Shchedrov and "Mnogolikaya Bezrabotitsa" [Many-Sided Unemployment] by Vladimir V. Bol'shakov	16	124	150
Poletayev, V., and Samsonov, A.--Donbass Workers: History and Contemporaneity ("Istoriya Rabochikh Donbassa" [History of the Donbass Workers])	3	120	147
Polyakov, Yu.--Fighting Year of 1918 (God 1918-y" [The Year 1918] by I. I. Mints)	4	115	138
Popov, V.--"His Entire Spirit Turned to the Homeland" ("Lenin v Finlyandii" [Lenin in Finland] by P. V. Moskovskiy and V. G. Semenov; "Lenin v Frantsii, Bel'gii i Danii [Lenin in France, Belgium and Denmark])	6	114	129
Rozhko, I.--The Communist Party and People's Sovereignty ("Partiya i Sovety" [The Party and the Soviets] by G. B. Khakalo; "The Party Leadership of the Soviets. Based on Materials of the Belorussian Communist Party," by A. I. Demisov and S. A. Radzhabov; "The Socialist State of the Whole People" (in the Light of the Resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress)" by Ye. M. Kovesnikov; "Perfecting Soviet Statehood and Democracy")	14	123	149
Sevost'yanov, P.--Soviet Diplomatic Documents	7	125	152
Sorokin, A.--World War II: Results and Lessons ("Istoriya Vtoroy Mirovoy Voyny 1939-1945" [History of World War II 1939-1945], vol 12, "Results and Lesson of World War II")	10	109	134
Tikhvinskiy, S.--The Working Class in the Struggle for Building Socialism and Elimination of the Fascist Threat" (Mezhdunarodnoye Rabocheye Dvizheniy. Veprosy Istorii i Teorii" [The			

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
International Labor Movement. Problems of History and Theory], vol 5, "Builder of Socialism and Fighter Against Fascism")	14	119	143
Tikhvinskiy, S.--Capital Exports--A Tool for Monopoly Expansion ("Vneshnyaya Ekspansiya Kapitala. Istoriya i Sovremennost'" [Foreign Expansion of Capital. History and Present Times], by A. A. Gromyko)	10	116	145
Tishkov, V.--National and Ethnic Problems in America ("Natsional'nyye Problemy Kanady" [National Problems in Canada]; "Natsional'nyye Protsessy v SShA" [National Processes in the United States]; "Natsionalnyye Protsessy v Tsentral'noy Amerike i Meksike" [National Processes in Central America and Mexico]; "Etnicheskiye Protsessy v Stranakh Yuzhnoy Ameriki" [Ethnic Process in South American Countries]; "Etnicheskiye Protsessy v Stranakh Karibskogo Morya" [Ethnic Processes in the Caribbean Countries])	8	123	148
Freitas, Jose--"Carnation Revolution" in Portugal ("Revolutsiya Gvozdi'k v Portugali" [The "Carnation Revolution" in Portugal] by V. I. Sukhanov)	18	113	137
Chervov, N.--Mechanism of Imperialist Aggression (SShA: Voyennaya Mashina i Politika" [United States: Military Machine and Politics] by R. G. Bogdanov)	18	114	139
Chernyak, A.--Tried Vanguard of the Soviet People ("Leninskaya Partiya--Partiya Novogo Tipa" [The Leninist Party--Party of a New Type] by V. Ya. Bondar'; "Vozrastaniye Rukovodyashchey Roli KPSS i Voprosy Organizatsionno-Politicheskoy Raboty" [Increased Leading Role of the CPSU and Problems of Organization-Political Work] by N. A. Petrovichev)	11	114	131
Shevchenko, V.--Fruitful Development of Marxist Sociophilosophical Theory ("Marksistsko-Leninskaya Teoriya Istoricheskogo Protsessa" [The Marxist-Leninist Theory of the Historical Process];			

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
"Ocherki po Istoricheskomu Materializmu" [Essays on Historical Materialism]; "Teoriya i Istoriya" [Theory and History] by V. Zh. Kelle and M. Ya. Koval'zon; "Istoricheskiy Materializm kak Sotsialno- Filosofskaya Teoriya" [Historical Materialism as a Sociophilosophical Theory]	10	105	126
Shutov, A.--Working Class and Bourgeois State ("SShA: Gosudarstvo i Rabochiy Klass" [United States Government and Working Class] by N. V. Sivachev))	9	127	157
Short Book Reviews	1, 3, 5, 14, 15, 16		
Bookshelf	1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16		

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/6

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

19 MARCH 1984